THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 10, 11 & 12. JANUARY—MARCH, 1943. Vol. XXXII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Dr. Raven and Reunion.

Dr. Raven, Master of Christ's College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, addressing the annual meeting of Liberal Evangelical Churchmen in London on February 17, made an impassioned appeal on behalf of reunion. The *Church Times* (February 19) summarized his plea as follows:

He spoke first of the growing number of Christians in this country who are professedly and avowedly undenominational because the disunion of the denominations scandalizes them. If they could be enlisted in the cause of Christian unity, their influence would be enormous.

To him the increasing fraternization of ministers of the various Christian denominations was a hopeful sign. Nowadays, not only 'a licensed free lance like myself,' but highly respected clergymen, were welcomed in Free Church places of worship, and preached there without protest from authority. This coming-together represented a passionate concern for those fundamental convictions which Christians shared in common, as well as an increasing knowledge that the things that divided Christians were largely out of date, and in any case of secondary importance. There was a growing conviction among Christian people, in face of modern rival ideologies, that 'if they did not all hang together, they would all hang separately in a very short time.'

But much depended on the extent to which contemporary movements in theology moved in the direction of unity. A union based on merely sentimental or emotional grounds on the one hand, or on economic considerations on the other, must be inadequate.

Another hopeful sign was a recovery in Free Church circles of the sense of the importance of the Church, though this was, to some extent, leading them to throw over their heritage of spiritual freedom in exchange for a somewhat stale though nominally Catholic pottage. Dr. Raven instanced a new Baptist scheme, which provided for superintendents whose functions were not unlike those of bishops. Indeed, one of its promoters apologized because 'it looked so like episcopacy.'

Christians generally were getting to the stage in which function rather than office was coming to be their concept of order. They were beginning to see that, if the Church was the body of Christ, it was the fitness of its officers to discharge their functions which mattered. If its officers ceased to do so adequately, they thereby ceased to be living representatives in the body. This might save Christians from wrangling about whether men who discharged the same function, but were called bishops in one denomination, and superintendents in another, differed so vitally as to be unable to meet at the same table of the Lord.

'My main anxiety about the South India Scheme,' Dr. Raven continued, 'is that we have been so exigent in our demands, have imposed so much on the generosity of our Congregationalist friends, as to put them in a position that, in conscience, they cannot accept what we expect them to accept.' He went on to speak of 'a strong recalcitrant body in our own communion for whom this whole idea of reunion is anathema.' He himself did not pay much attention to the rebuke administered to Dr. Temple by Bishop Manning of New York. 'It would not affect the Archbishop's stock in God's own country.' Nevertheless, there was a very real and definite opposition in certain quarters in the Anglican Church all over its wide communion.

But there were indications that their Anglo-Catholic friends were very much less united in their concept of order and what constituted Catholicity than they were ten years ago. He saw the signs of a very sharp cleavage in Anglo-Catholic ranks, and he thought it possible that in the next four or five years that cleavage might have a marked result. Some were moving towards a functional concept of the ministry, laying stress upon a hierarchical distinction, and were thereby creating a split in the hitherto staunch adherence of the party to a Roman view of orders.

The acceptance of the South India Scheme was vital to the Evangelical movement. Its frustration would mean the indefinite postponement of their hopes for reunion at home and a definite setback to the whole Evangelical cause within the Church of England.

Dr. Raven's plea for reunion will have the support of all Liberal Churchmen. They have no doubt as to the urgent need for reunion; they have no doubt as to the rightness of reunion. The problem for them is to secure a *method* of reunion which (1) will have the support, whole-hearted and united, of the Liberal and Evangelical schools within the Church; (2) will be acceptable to their fellow-Christians who are at present separated from them; (3) is capable of practical and progressive realization; (4) will not lead to the separation of our Anglo-Catholic members from the Church of England.

This method must be that of inter-communion among all who profess and call themselves Christians. For this, all that is necessary is that our bishops should issue an encyclical letter inviting the communicant members of all Christian bodies to receive the Holy Communion whenever they wish in the Church of England, and telling them that it is heartily desired that they will avail themselves of this fraternal invitation.

What is here proposed is as simple as it is practical. It demands no complicated negotiations, no agreement on controversial

doctrinal and ecclesiastical issues. It demands only Christian charity, calm courage and wise statesmanship on the part of our English bishops. We may rightly look for the exercise of these qualities by our leaders in a crisis so perilous not only to the welfare of the National Church, but perilous also to the welfare of our English Christianity.

We do not believe that any but a very few of our fellow Anglo-Catholic Churchmen would regard such episcopal action as justifying their own separation from the Church of England. They might regard such episcopal action as injudicious, undesirable and irregular; but they cannot rightly regard it as an abandonment of the 'Catholic heritage' possessed by the Church of England. We believe that their more able and responsible leaders will agree with this statement. May we add that we think that their own position in the Church of England would be strengthened, not weakened, by their acceptance of what we must admit is from their point of view a policy of compromise. The Anglo-Catholic party gained much in strength and influence when, under the leadership of Charles Gore and the *Lux Mundi* school, they exchanged the limitations of Tractarianism for the wider outlook and progressive policy of Liberal Churchmen. Should they repeat these tactics now, their gains would prove far greater than their losses. This suggestion is made in all good-will and honesty; and we hope, for the sake of all parties in the Church of England, and for the welfare of Christianity as a whole, that the Anglo-Catholic leaders will not fail to unite in supporting this policy.

Christian reunion in this land, so it seems to us, stands or falls by the willingness or unwillingness of our bishops to offer intercommunion or to refuse it and substitute a niggling policy of half-measures for it.

We conclude our plea with a quotation from the *Annual Report* of the Student Christian Movement, 1941-42:

> 'The S.C.M. is not a Church and so is not competent to pronounce upon the difficult issues involved in the question of intercommunion; but it is evident that our membership is increasingly restive under the present situation. This is partly due to a keener sense of denominational loyalty and also to a more general recognition throughout the denominations of the centrality which the service of Holy Communion holds in Christian worship. Christians who are not members of an interdenominational fellowship are, we think, unaware of the problem here presented to those who are. It therefore behoves us to speak very plainly since the pressure to solve this problem is not likely to come from the general membership of the Churches. The present position is a cause of much confusion and offence to those who join an interdenomination fellowship and are not versed in ecclesiastical history. We express the earnest hope that the Churches will not allow this question to go by default but will fearlessly face it anew. We plead for wise and swift action now' (p. 15).

Pan-Protestantism and Pseudo-Catholicism.

The *Guardian* of January 8 published the following significant letter by 66 Ordinands:

Sir,—We, as ordinands, are seriously disturbed by the present tendencies of those in authority to jettison the historic principles of the Church of England, in matters both of Faith and Order.

In the first place, the proposed scheme for the union of the Churches in South India would seem:

(1) By proposing to associate presbyters liturgically in the consecration of bishops, to obscure the historic episcopate as the sole source of Order.

'No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination' (*Preface to the Anglican Ordinal*).

(2) By making the bishop, in the last resort, subservient to the Synod—in spite of the objections raised to this by the Lambeth Consultative Body in 1938—to obliterate the historic status of the episcopate as the only authoritative legislature.

(3) By its failure to insist on an episcopally-ordained ministry as a *sine qua non* of communion, to deny the necessity of the historic threefold Ministry. (See the 7th Revised Edition of the *Proposed Scheme of Church Union in South India,* p. 32, and compare the Preface to the Anglican Ordinal):

'It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. . . . And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England; No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.'

(4) By leaving open the possibility, even if only in exceptional cases, of the celebration of the Holy Communion by persons not in priests' orders, to ignore the Anglican conception of the priesthood in relation to the consecration of the Eucharist—namely the indispensability of the *Sacerdotium* to a valid offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. (See *The Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on English Ordination,* Section xi, p. 35.)

(5) By providing that, after the thirty years' period, the question of ministers not episcopally ordained shall be subject to review, to leave open the possibility that non-episcopal ordination may continue indefinitely. (See the 7th Revised Edition of the *Proposed Scheme of Church Union in South India,* p. 40.)

(6) By proposing to reduce confirmation to the level of an optional alternative to the services of admission to full membership current among non-Episcopal bodies, to stress insufficiently the truth that the Holy Ghost is thereby bestowed.

In addition to these disquieting proposals in South India, a very deliberate attempt is being made at home to undermine the Catholic heritage of the Church of England.

The recent proposals of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury with regard to the interchange of pulpits with non-Anglicans seem to ignore the grave dogmatic differences which exist between them and the Church of England, in spite of attention being drawn to them in the preamble to the proposals. While these dogmatic differences remain — *e.g.*, in the sphere of morals and in the sacramental view of life — it would seem impossible to reach any measure of agreement on:

(*a*) 'the promotion of Christian Evangelism at home';

(*b*) 'the work of Christian missions overseas';

(*c*) the prayers to be used 'on special occasions of national or local prayer and thanksgiving or of national humiliation, or in commemoration of the fallen in war or of the victims of disaster'—which are to be the occasions for the interchange of pulpits. In effect, this will be to put the visiting minister in a very unenviable position; first, he will have to listen to a series of prayers of which he cannot in conscience approve, and then he will be prevented by courtesy (and the necessity of presenting a united front) from saying what he really believes. Thus, the proposals would seem to be entirely irrelevant, as they will serve no useful purpose whatsoever. (See Dr. Oscar Hardman, *Anglican Relations with Nonconformity*.)

These tendencies we have mentioned form an attempt to impose a kind of Pan-Protestantism, which is inconsistent with the nature of the Church of England. Consequently, we feel bound to ask the question: 'To what are we committing ourselves in seeking ordination?' We find ourselves in the position of being expected to present, as it were, a *carte blanche* to the authorities, who may at any time decide to abandon what we believe to be the historic Faith and Order of the Church — the very ethos of the Church of England.

This causes us to feel that the Church of England will probably find the shortage of ordinands even more acute than it has been rendered already by the war situation.

66 ORDINANDS.

There were many replies to this challenge, but undoubtedly the weightiest of them came from Dr. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, in his letter published in the *Guardian* of January 15:

SIR,—I venture to think that it would be desirable that the 66 Ordinands who have written to you on the South India scheme should read and meditate on two contributions in the same issue of your paper—the letter on prayer for unity, and that most interesting address, 'In Oppressed Europe.' Perhaps they might learn that, if we pray for unity, we must be prepared to sacrifice some of our own prejudices, as well as ask others to do so; and that 'To be a Christian has proved to be a more important thing than to be a Catholic or Protestant.'

Let us consider the situation. As a basis of union, we call on all those with Presbyterian or Congregationalist Orders to accept the Historic Church Order. I believe that we are right to do so. I believe that a united Church must have a united ministry; that the only possible basis for that is the Historic Church Order, and that, therefore, in spite of the uncertainty of the evidence for the apostolic origin of episcopacy, we are, I believe, right in pressing it. The other Churches have accepted it.

But consider what a sacrifice of their traditions it means. They are giving up, for the sake of Christian unity, traditions of ministry which have prevailed among them for three hundred years. Some of their spiritual forefathers laid down their lives for their opposition to prelacy. What are we asked to do?

It is very little. The Lambeth Conference has said that we recognize the spiritual reality of these ministries. 'We thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace.' Can we do anything else, when we realize the spiritual power and the theological eminence of many ministers in these Churches, how large a part they have played in preserving the Christianity of this country, when we remember that in the United Indian Church there are 500,000 native Christians won by that Church to Christ?

The 66 Ordinands quote the English Ordinal to justify their position of refusing to recognize in any way the ministries and sacraments of non-episcopal bodies. The Ordinal does not support such a view. Our Prayer Book asserts clearly and definitely our own rule and practice, but carefully abstains from condemning the ministries of other Churches. Our Articles are so drawn up as to allow the recognition in their own Church of their ministries. We know that Bishop Cosin, when on the Continent, communicated in non-episcopal Churches. So the partial recognition given to the ministry of those Churches which are coming together in unity is in accordance both with Anglican tradition and Christian charity.

The association of presbyters in the consecration of bishops is designed to continue the tradition of all the Churches which are uniting. We do not wish to create a united Church by the submission of other Churches, but by all alike contributing their spiritual heritage. There is much that we can gain from these other Churches. The Anglican Church is not infallible. It has not a monopoly of spiritual life. There are many defects in our own religious traditions which union with other Churches will correct.

There is no command of our Lord, or word of Scripture, which justifies one denying the religious efficacy of non-episcopal sacraments. The best Catholic theology tells me that our Lord is the Minister of every sacrament. Do these 66 Ordinands really believe that when devout Presbyterians or Congregationalists meet together to obey His last command, our Lord would refuse them His blessing, or give them some inferior blessing because they had no episcopal Orders? If I thought that was true, I should find it difficult to be a Christian.

Do the 66 Ordinands know that St. Thomas Aquinas, whose authority as a theologian they perhaps respect, did not consider Confirmation to be a necessary prerequisite even for ordination? We believe that confirmation will inevitably be adopted in a united Church, but why make it a *sine qua non* for reunion?

It is very kind of the 66 Ordinands, with their greater theological knowledge and wider religious experience, to correct the proposal of the Upper House of Convocation for uniting with other Christian bodies in evangelism at home and abroad, and in prayers for the nation. Surely when Christianity finds itself face to face with an evil anti-Christian spirit, it is the duty of all Christians to combine in every way that they can to present the Christian message to the world. No union of Christian Churches could ever take place if we were to adopt the mental attitude of these 66 Ordinands. In fact, we should have to break up the Church of England into several separate communities.

Our Church bids us not to consider anything necessary which has not the authority of Scripture. I find no Scriptural authority for these meticulous demands. The Council of Chalcedon anathematizes, not only those who refuse to accept the Christian Creed, but also all those who would

add to the faith. It is because so many Christian bodies have confused their own prejudices with the Christian faith that the divisions of Christendom have arisen.

They ask what they are committing themselves to in being ordained. It is to preach the Gospel of Christ as it is put forth in the Prayer Book and the Ordination Service. Is not that sufficient? They are not committed to the glosses of Anglo-Catholicism.

A. C. GLOUCESTER.

The Psalmist's statement, 'There were they in great fear where no fear was,' seems to us to describe the situation of our 66 Ordinands. Their Catholic heritage is not endangered by any of the proposals against which they protest. The Church of England has no intention of abandoning the historic episcopate. Although our Church does not hold that the episcopate is of the *esse* of the Church, yet it believes it to be of the *bene esse*. The authority of the episcopate, as the study of its evolution shows, is neither absolute nor isolated: its authority is constitutional and is shared with the presbyterate or priesthood and is representative of the priesthood of the laity.

The proposal to associate presbyters with bishops in the consecration of a bishop can in no way invalidate the authority of the bishop so consecrated. At every ordination of priests in our English Church our priests or presbyters are associated with the bishop in the laying on of hands on those who are ordained priests. This is in accordance with the practice of the sub-apostolic Church, as Bishop Lightfoot's epoch-making essay on 'The Christian Ministry' demonstrates historically. There is little doubt that the primitive monarchical bishop, if consecrated at all, was at first consecrated by the laying on of hands of the presbyterate in the church in which the laity had elected him to preside. Consecration by monarchical bishops from neighbouring churches must have been a later custom.

Our 66 Ordinands do not seem to be aware that the Roman Church does not regard the episcopate as a separate order of ministers. For the Roman Church, as for St. Jerome, the bishop is *primus inter pares*, the head-presbyter. Hence the proposal to which our Ordinands object is not a departure from Catholicism but may be more truly described as a return to primitive Catholicism.

With regard to the Episcopal Confirmation of the baptized, we would remind our 66 Ordinands that for a long period many thousands of our fellow-Churchmen in the New World, although admitted to Holy Communion, were never episcopally confirmed, as, owing to the strong feelings which existed there against prelacy, no episcopal sees were established in New England, Newfoundland, or the West Indies; and crossing the Atlantic in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was seldom, if ever, adventured by our English bishops.

There is perhaps no need to remind our Ordinands that, in the Orthodox Church, Confirmation is not administered by the bishops but by the priests, the latter in the ceremony making use of unction episcopally consecrated. In our 1662 Confirmation Service there is no statement that the Holy Spirit is imparted to the confirmed by the touch of the bishop's hand. In the Roman Church it is customary for many young people to receive the Holy Communion before Confirmation. While we regard Confirmation as a very valuable completion of Baptism, and therefore as a service to be maintained in our Church, it must be admitted in the light of the facts cited that it is possible to admit of wide variations in the method of its administration without insisting that such variations deprive of its Catholic heritage the Church that uses them.

The cause of the apprehensions of our Ordinands is that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in their Catholicity. Let them meditate on the *dictum* of St. Ignatius, who was the first of our Church Fathers to apply the term Catholic to the Church :

> 'Wheresoever the bishop appears, there let the congregation be, even as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church' (*Epistle to the Smyrnaeans,* viii).

Free Church Ministers in our Parish Pulpits.

The protest of the '66 Ordinands' against the admission of Free Church ministers as preachers to Church of England congregations at national services in our parish churches — recently sanctioned by the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury —deserves serious attention. It demands vigorous and decisive action, since, if the protest be acquiesced in, endeavours to secure Christian reunion in our homeland will be thwarted.

As the letter of the ordinands indicates, their arguments are not their own. Similar arguments were recently used by Dr. Kirk, Bishop of Oxford, in the *Oxford Diocesan Magazine* : Professor Oscar Hardman would seem to be their ultimate source. The arguments are ingenious but utterly unconvincing. At services loyal to the spirit of the Prayer Book and to our English Church ways, Free Churchmen would find themselves able to take part with as much sympathy as that felt by educated laymen. Of course there are church services, held in some of our English parish churches, which are so alien to our English Church ideals that Free Church ministers would feel as uncomfortable in taking part in them as do the majority of English Churchmen when they happen to take part in such services. Such services, although on the increase, are still in the minority.

What, however, concerns us most in this matter is that there is an organized opposition to admitting Free Church ministers into our parish church pulpits and that this opposition movement is receiving support from some of our English bishops. The effective remedy for such a situation is :

> That our Church Authorities shall recognize the right of the incumbent of a parish, with the consent of both churchwardens and the support of the parochial church council, to invite ministers of other Christian denominations to deliver sermons in the pulpits of their parish churches.

This would avoid the necessity for troubling the diocesan bishop and prevent the painful sensation caused in a parish when the bishop who is not in agreement with the proposal of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury in this matter refuses to give his consent. The recognition of the parochial right in this matter would also ensure that both the incumbent and the official representatives of the parish—who might be expected to know the mind of the parish better than does the diocesan bishop—were acting in accordance with the desires of the parishioners.

This matter is clearly one to be decided by the incumbent of the parish and by the parishioners; and there is really no need for the bishop to be troubled about the matter, since the general principle has been approved by the Bishops of the Province in Convocation. We hope that the proposal to recognize the exercise by parishes of this right will receive the sympathetic support of our episcopate.

The Primate and Dr. Whale.

Dr. Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Dr. Whale, Moderator of the Free Church Council, have jointly issued a statement of Christian Belief as the basis of practical Christian co-operation. The most important section of it runs as follows :

> We believe—
>
> That the world exists by the righteous will of the living God ; that He is the one creator and ruler of all things ; that this present world is the sphere in which His eternal purpose of love is being wrought out ; that men have to do with Him, their only true life being a right relation to Him in obedience and trust, and to one another in love ; that He makes men free personal beings able to choose good or evil ; that man tends from birth to be self-centred and prone to choose evil, and that his self-centredness becomes a curse from which he cannot by his own effort set himself free ; that in this historical process which has gone wrong God Himself is nevertheless personally at work ; the creator is also the redeemer.
>
> We believe—
>
> That God took hold of human history and individual human lives in a new way in the great act of the Incarnation ; that the birth and life, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ is nothing less than God's own

redeeming presence and purpose actively manifested in historic time; that in Him God the Son became man, perfectly human yet without sin or self-centredness; that He lived among men disclosing in a human life that holy love which is God's nature, and that perfect filial relationship to the Father which is man's true nature; that His death on the Cross makes plain for ever the meaning and measure of man's sin as rebellion against God; that sin there wrote its own condemnation indelibly on the pages of history and was judged with absolute finality; that by bearing the full burden of its evil consequences the divine Redeemer showed not only the cost of our sin to God, but also, and in the same act, the eternal love of God which is willing to bear that cost; thereby He declared God's forgiveness to those who repent and believe; that is, to those who give up their selfish outlook and receive the forgiveness which God freely offers. We believe that God set His seal upon this life and death of perfect obedience and perfect love by raising Jesus Christ from the dead, establishing within the corporate life of sinful humanity a creative centre of righteousness, and making altogether new spiritual possibilities for men living in this world.

We believe—

That God by His Holy Spirit makes the redeeming work of Christ available to all men; that by thus living and dying and rising from the dead Christ has become the means by which the Spirit of the living God exercises a new power over their hearts and wills; that God who as Spirit is ever active among men — speaking to them in all ages through their consciences and most specially through the prophets of Israel — is now known in all His fullness only in the experience of those whose hearts are open to His love in Christ; that is, those who are brought into the movement of God's new creative work in history which is the fellowship of Christ's disciples and is called the Church. Further, we believe that though God's redeeming action embraces all humanity and will not disclose its full meaning until its victory is universal, the high ends of His Kingdom are nevertheless realized sacramentally here and now and made invisible in the life of the Church. Thus this present world, in spite of all its evil, is nevertheless a redeemed order, and man's highest life both here and hereafter lies in the redeemed society whose life is even now 'hid with Christ in God.'

We believe—

That the Kingdom of Heaven which Christ proclaimed and embodied will be known in its perfection only in the eternal life of which our life here is a preparatory portion, but that it is our duty to live here and now as citizens of that Kingdom; that God is at work in the world to ends which must of necessity transcend this world and all human experience here, but that we are called to work with Him in obedience, trust and love for the realization of His purpose on earth. This means that we must seek first God's Kingdom and His justice, not our own interest of comfort, and try to make love of our neighbour the rule of all our actions. This we can do effectively only as we live within the redeemed order, realizing that this world of sin and death is still God's world and that our fellow-man is always the 'brother for whom Christ died.' In short, the creative centre of our effective moral action is the redeeming act of God who was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.

This is only an interim statement and has not yet been considered or endorsed by the authorities of either the Anglican or Free Church Communions.

With great hesitation we venture to question the underlying theological soundness of this document. It seems to us to suggest that the Incarnation was brought about in consequence of the Fall, or, as the document expresses it, as the result of 'this historical process which has gone wrong.' Orthodox theology teaches that the Incarnation was not caused by Man's sin, nor is the Incarnation dependant on the *felix culpa*. The Incarnation is an original and inherent constituent of the divine creative method, as the creation of Man in the image of God indicates. This is clearly shown by Bishop Westcott in his illuminating essay entitled *The Gospel of Creation*.[1]

Irrespective of the theological soundness of its doctrine, we regard this joint statement of Christian Belief as most significant, since it is the combined composition of the heads of our two largest bodies of English Christians. If these two Christian leaders are able to agree in a confessional statement of this length, there is good hope that with some further effort they will be able to achieve together the re-writing of the Thirty-nine Articles.

For ourselves, we should have been satisfied if the formula for the basis of Christian co-operation had been expressed in three words, 'God is Love'; but if this should seem too brief, we should have been equally satisfied with the following New Testament declaration of Christian Faith and Duty:

> 'This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God and Him whom Thou didst send, Jesus Christ.'
>
> 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself.'

Such a confession as this ought to suffice for practical Christian co-operation; but if it be thought that still more is needed, we should be disposed to adopt the method of the English eighteenth century bishop who, when asked 'What is the Christian Religion?' answered, 'I prefer to tell you not what it is but where it may be found. It is found here,' said he, laying his hand on the New Testament.

New alternative Creeds — and we sorely need them — for confessional, liturgical and practical purposes are, we hold, best expressed in the venerated and familiar words of the Bible. If, however, something more modern is desired, then we would commend to our leaders the following Confession of Christian Faith and Duty recently published by the Student Christian Movement:

> As a Christian Movement we affirm our faith in God, our Father, whose nature is creative love and power.
>
> God is made known to us in Jesus Christ, in whom we see the true expression of His being and the true nature of man.

[1] Published in *The Epistles of St. John.* (Macmillan, 1909; pp. 283-328.)

Through His life and triumphant death, and through the living energy of the Spirit, we share in the redeeming love which overcomes evil, and find forgiveness, freedom, and eternal life.

Faced with the need and perplexity of the world, we desire to give ourselves to Christ and to follow Him wherever He may call us.

We seek the Kingdom of God, the re-creation of all mankind into one family, without distinction of race or nation, class or capacity.

We desire to enter into that fellowship of worship, thought and service which is the heritage of the Christian Church.[2]

Australia's Presbyterian Prophet.

Our readers will be glad to learn that Dr. Angus, the most learned of Christian theologians south of the equator — and, we may add, the most persecuted, having endured seven trials for heresy in Presbyterian Church Courts — has had his proposed eighth trial removed from the *agenda* of the Federal Assembly, so that it cannot possibly take place until three years have elapsed. This adjournment will permit Dr. Angus to retain his professorship in St. Andrew's College in the University of Sydney, to the great satisfaction of all Australian Modernists.

The writer of many contributions to the true understanding of the Christian Religion — the most outstanding of which are *The Mystery Religions and Christianity* (1925) and *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (1929), standard works known to every serious student of Primitive Christianity—Dr. Angus has recently added a volume which should interest and inspire a wider public, *Essential Christianity*.[1] To attempt to 'pot' the contents of this book would be to do it the gravest injustice. It is a spirited plea for the modern Christian method in the treatment of our theological and ecclesiastical difficulties at the present time.

Dr. Angus pleads for a drastic simplification of Christian dogmas. He claims that Christian character and conduct are independent of any except the most fundamental and comprehensive of Christian dogmas, and that the proof of the truth of the Christian religion must be sought and found in the fruits of the Spirit which it produces. We could heartily wish that every clergyman in the Church of England—not to say every Anglican bishop —would read and weigh the arguments of this great Presbyterian scholar. He stands for no timid niggling policy, but for a Christian theological and ecclesiastical revolution not destructive but constructive and essentially evolutionary, since it seeks to preserve all the moral and spiritual Christian values and to augment them.

[2] Student Christian Movement, *Annual Report*, 1941-42, p. 29.

[1] *Essential Christianity*, by Prof. S. Angus, Ph.D., D.Litt., D.D. Published by John Murray, 1939; price 6*s*.

In this volume Dr. Angus includes a service used by Dr. Karl Reiland in St. George's Church, New York, which we believe some of our readers may value. It might well be entitled

AN ACT OF FAITH.

After an opening hymn the Minister shall say:

Let us unite in affirming those things which are most surely believed among us.

We believe that God is spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

We believe that God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the whole earth.

We believe that God is love, and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

We believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

We believe that Jesus Christ is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

We believe that if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

We believe in the grace of our Lord, in the love of God, and in the fellowship of the Spirit. *Amen.*

Minister: Now may the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Spirit.

Then, kneeling, minister and people shall say together the prayer following:

Almighty God and Father of us all, in whose ever present help is our confidence, and in whose everlasting mercy is our trust, hear the prayer we make before thee and pardon our transgressions.

Whatsoever things are true and just, pure and lovely and of good report, give us the mind to think on these things, that we may serve thee among men with an enlightened conscience, an obedient heart and a teachable spirit.

Show us the way wherein we should walk and the work we must do. Let us not despise thy law when we prosper, nor distrust thy loving kindness when we fail.

We pray for all who suffer from wrong, or ill-health or hopelessness, from sharpness of pain, the hurt of ingratitude or the bitterness of tears.

Comfort thou the anguish of bereavement and the pitifulness of distress. Have compassion on the prisoners, the weary in their toil and the neglected in old age.

Shelter with thy protecting wing the lives of little children. Bless the ties of every home and heart, the means of our living and the manner of our leisure, and bless all men everywhere. *Amen.*

DR. ANGUS ON SPIRITUAL VALUES AND THE NEW ORDER.

Dr. Angus, in a recent Australian broadcast, speaking on 'Spiritual Values and the New Order,' said:

'That the coming of the *New* Order will also be a *better* order is by no means a certainty. The selfishness, the baneful group-mindedness, the secularization of life, the extravagant nationalism, the prevalent cult of comfort which misnames itself civilization, the loss of spiritual balance, the maintenance of superficial and false standards, which are all surely dissolving our present order, bear within them no promise of a better and saner order or of a social rebirth.

A *better* order depends wholly for its establishment and continuance upon an order of better men and women therein who, having discovered the richness and fulness of life, strive to bring such richness and fulness to others. We must strive for freedom — freedom not to live as parasites on the labour of others, but freedom to maintain that autonomy and independence for others which we resolutely claim for ourselves, yet must ever be limited by the good and the freedom of others.'

First, the New Order must have a spiritual basis:

'Even a materialist millenium cannot be established while there is moral anarchy in the soul of its citizens.'

'The evils which pollute the atmosphere of our democratic life are due not so much to external maladjustments; they lie deeper in the moral and spiritual places where there is sore need of painful purificatory exercises upon ourselves. Nothing can alter the perennial truth that at all times "the Kingdom of God is within" us; and so is the New Order.'

Secondly, the ideal of the New Order places too much confidence in what parliamentary enactments can do to establish it and not sufficient emphasis on the contribution which must be made by each individual.

'There is a naïve confidence in parliamentary enactments, in the multiplicity of boards, the setting up of bureaux, and increasing departmental powers.'

Thirdly, there is a subtle hypocrisy that refuses to face hard facts which are in conflict with popular sentimental theories whether political, economic or social.

'There is a deceptive zeal in the persistent dealing with obvious effects rather than with their underlying causes, in treating the symptoms of the body politic rather than eradicating the deep-seated disease which threatens its dissolution. Disproportionate attention is being paid to social environment without due concern for the inequality of the human beings to be environed, and this gives reason to fear that the banished evil spirit may take with him the seven spirits more evil than himself and return to claim possession.

Moreover, most of these new orders rest upon a false equalitarianism, which overlooks the obstinate facts of the marked inequalities of human character and capacity, and the equally marked inequalities in the moral sense of personal responsibility in the offices of citizenship and in willingness for self-sacrifice.'

Clearly Dr. Angus is not one who, if he criticizes the priest, secures popularity by flattering the populace and 'boosting' the politician.

'And they, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, yet shall know that there hath been a prophet among them.'

The New Approach to Foreign Missions.

Canon Geoffrey Allen, before returning to his work in China, delivered three lectures (just published) at Trinity College, Dublin, on *The Theology of Missions*.[1] The first lecture deals with 'The Missionary Motive,' the second with 'The Missionary Approach,' and the third with 'The Missionary Method.' On the missionary *motive* he writes:

> 'We may not appeal first to man's desire for peace and security and prosperity, and then draw in the thought of God as a means for achieving our welfare on earth. If we did this, religion would degenerate at once into magic. The needs of man would have been made primary, and God would be an after-thought for the satisfaction of our desires. Moreover the magic would not in fact work. In appealing to the self-interest of man, we should have left unchanged and uncured the root evil which is the cause of the sickness of society. If the right order is maintained, then we shall say that through the surrender of individual and corporate self-seeking in worship of God, men will find as reward their own peace on earth. The peace for which we seek will not come so long as we make it the direct object of our search; but it will come as the indirect gift of God when we set first His glory and His kingdom. Over the world to-day there is heard again the pathetic lament of God, which Isaiah heard in his day: "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! Then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea" (*Isaiah* xlviii, 18). We shall rightly make considerable use of the motive of the salvation of society; we shall, however, keep it in its proper place and proportion, by stressing the saying of our Lord, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you" (*Matthew* vi, 33)' (p. 23).

Of the missionary *approach* to other races, cultures and religions he writes:

> 'There is a saying of Clement of Alexandria, "There is one river of truth, but many streams fall into it on this side and that." I am told that Professor Whitehead once said, in conversation, that Christianity had made one great adjustment in its history when it sifted and accepted the best from the Greek philosophical tradition; and that a second similar adjustment awaited it, as the learning of the East was similarly sifted and baptized into Christ. There sometimes seems to be a spiritual law, comparable to the biological law, that where any group lives to itself with in-breeding it suffers from a decay of vitality, and that cross-fertilization is necessary for renewal of life. Certainly the two great periods, when there was a flowing together of the Hebrew and the Hellenic traditions, the first four centuries and the Renaissance, were periods of very great spiritual and intellectual vitality in the life of the Church. It may be that our Western civilization has lived too long to itself, and is suffering from a sterility of soul. There are many signs in the present state of Europe that there is a decay of Christian faith and Christian statesmanship. It may be that the century of missionary expansion in the East has brought us to the threshold of a new period of vitality and awakening in the life of the Church. Perhaps that second adjustment, of which

[1] *The Theology of Missions*, by Canon Geoffrey Allen. Published by the S.C.M., 1943; price 2*s*. 6*d*.

Professor Whitehead speaks, is about to take place; perhaps one of those new rivers, of which Clement speaks, is going to reach and join the central stream of Christian tradition. If so, our tired world may be about to enter a period of rejuvenation comparable to the first four centuries and the Renaissance. Certainly there will be dangers. We shall accept a warning from Dr. Kraemer on the dangers of a too easy syncretism which would water down the distinctiveness of the Christian Faith. Nevertheless, as we reject the evil, we shall also be prepared to receive and learn from the good. If we refused to do that, we might dam up the living stream of inspiration. It may be that God has still new lessons to teach us, as a new light is thrown from the background of another heritage on the meaning of Christian revelation. It is not without significance that social relationships in family and state are a place where our Western organization has been very weak; and that it is on these relationships that the philosophy of China has been concentrated. Behind the present political alliance of China and of Russia with the democracies, there may be a deeper purpose of the Lord of all history for the forward movement of the spirit of man in social and international reconstruction. When the smoke-screens of battle and bomb have cleared away, and when the names of dictators are a distant memory, it may be that some future historian will say that the real significance of our present period was the flowing together of the streams of Western Christianity and Eastern learning, which inaugurated a new awakening of the mind of man in obedience to his one Universal Creator and Saviour and Lord' (pp. 50-51).

In dealing with the missionary *method* Canon Allen stresses the awakening of the State, especially in China, due to the inspiration of Christian missions in that country, particularly in the sphere of education, medicine and social amelioration.

'To-day the education and health and welfare of the community have become the concern of the Government. As a result, the younger Churches and the missionary societies must undertake a re-thinking of their whole policy, parallel with the re-thinking of the relationship of Church and State in the West. We touch here on issues which are highly controversial. Their solution will only be found through a generation of thought and experiment in the life of every nation' (p. 68).

Plainly, important adjustments are needed in the work of Christian missions as a consequence of this new situation created by the Christian missions themselves. Canon Allen foresees these adjustments as being made in the preservation of Christian influence and in co-operation with the State. We need hardly add, now that China has a great Christian ruler and leader, that Christian co-operation with the State is immensely facilitated.

'If the various needs of the community can be met more thoroughly and on a wider scale through State service, then as Christians we shall support and co-operate with such State activity. The Church will encourage its members to serve as officers of the State, and at the same time seek to spread Christian influence through their service amid the activities of the State.

It is especially important to see the need of such co-operation in the field of education. In Britain we are at last realizing that we have allowed a whole generation to grow up in ignorance of the first and simplest

fundamentals of Christian teaching, through the failure of the Church to co-operate with the State in government schools. This failure has in turn been caused by the disunion of the Churches and their failure to agree on a common policy towards the State for Christian education' (pp. 71-72).

'If, in missionary planning, we concentrate in littleness of mind on our own existing lines of work, and if we miss the need of co-operation in new ways with the State, then we shall surrender to non-Christian influence vast tracts of future world leadership' (p. 72).

'So . . . we must see the urgent issue of reunion in its relation to the missionary task of the Church.

In very many respects the lead toward reunion is coming from the younger Churches. It is most important that the older Churches should accept and welcome this lead, and should not frustrate it by a conservative insistence on the divisions which have grown up in our own history, and which seem irrelevant to those who have not got our own historical background.

In the younger Churches denominations are already united, which are close to one another, but which are still divided in the West' (p. 73).

'China and India are twenty years ahead of Great Britain in the establishment of a National Christian Council' (p. 73).

'The disunion of Churches, and the remaining disunion and lack of co-operation in missions, leads to frustration in evangelism, poverty in range of appointment, failure in co-operation with the State, and waste and inefficiency in organization' (p. 76).

Against this background of darkness and difficulty we have a sunlit glimpse in the foreground. Canon Allen writes:

'In my own theological college in China, the Episcopal Church, the Church of Christ in China, and the united Chinese Methodist Church all combine for the training of the ministry. We have worked out a basis of co-operation which gives in miniature the path toward reunion. We all seek to bring the best from our own heritage into the one college; we are all glad to respect and learn from the best in the heritage of other Churches than our own. In the present state of the divided Church, we give to each communion the right for whatever special courses of lectures and for whatever services it requires for the education of its own members. For the greater part of our worship and our teaching we find that we can combine and trust one another, each contributing to the college at whatever place we have each the best training and experience for doing so. We are thus sending out all the time into the Church in China young leaders who have learnt from the start to respect the best in each Christian heritage, and who have made friends with those who will become leaders in other Churches' (p. 74).

At the present time we have in England a Commission investigating methods for the improvement or reform of our Theological College system and the Training of Ordinands. We wonder whether they have ever considered proposals to establish inter-denominational theological colleges in this country, and what support they would give to such theological colleges were they founded.

TOUCHING FOR THE KING'S EVIL

By the Rev. John Todd, M.A., Rector of Waterstock, Oxford.

IN many of our parish registers are to be found entries made in the days of Charles II, James II or Queen Anne referring to certificates granted by the minister to parishioners suffering from the king's evil. Thus, in my own register of Waterperry is an entry:

> 'March 22nd 1683/4. I gave Mary Spencer a certificate for the king's evil, Goodman Hunt being churchwarden.'

Again in 1708 it is noted:

> 'I gave Alice the daughter of Philip Smith (aged about 4 yeare) a certificate for ye king's evil, John Smith being churchwarden, Wm Lewis vicar.'

What is the history which lies behind these entries? What is the practice to which these certificates refer?

The disease popularly known as 'king's evil,' or, to use the medical term, scrofula, is tuberculosis of the lymphatic glands. The glands, especially those in the neck, become inflamed, the tissues partake of the inflammation; and matter, the product of the inflammation, forms abscesses and discharges through ulcers. In mild cases, where the patient is free from constitutional disease, the mischief ends there. The wounds heal, the glands return to their former size, and the patient recovers without any damage beyond the scars left by the ulcers as they heal. The disease is of a lingering character, slow to yield to any known treatment, and liable to extend its ravages to any part of the body. 'Touching for the king's evil' was the ceremony whereby this tuberculosis was cured by the touch of the hand of the Sovereign of England, and as late as the eighteenth century a service for use at this ceremony was to be found in the Book of Common Prayer. In France the practice was older than in England and lasted longer. The last French king to 'touch' was Charles X, who at his coronation in 1824 touched 121 people. But a discussion of the practice in France would take us too far afield. We must limit ourselves to England.

Tradition asserts that Edward the Confessor was the first of our kings to possess the miraculous gift, and the tradition is most probably true. For twenty-eight years before he became King of England, Edward had lived in Normandy and he may there have heard of the practice which was already well established at the French court. At any rate an almost contemporary chronicle of Westminster gives a detailed account of a cure which he wrought on a scrofulous woman, and William of Malmesbury reproduced this account in his Chronicle *c.* 1125 and declared his belief that

the miracle was performed, not in virtue of his kingly descent, but in virtue of his holiness.

Although the practice in England began with the Confessor, there is no indication that it was continued by his Norman successors, either by William the Conqueror, William Rufus, Henry I or Stephen, and not until we come to Henry II do we find a contemporary ascribing therapeutic power to the king. Peter de Blois, Archdeacon of Bath and later Archdeacon of London, was chaplain to Henry II, and in a letter (Epistle 150) to the Clerks of the King's Household he appeals to this gift of the king, this *curatio scrofulorum*, as to something well known and attributes the gift to royal unction, *unctionis regiae sacramentum*. There is no reference to the practice in the reign of Richard nor in that of John, nor, rather surprisingly, in that of Henry III, but there is abundant evidence to show that the practice was well established in the reign of Edward I. For example, in the Household Accounts (*Computus Hospitii*) of Edward I for 1277-1278, amongst similar entries, is *Die Lune xi die Aprilis pro C* $\frac{xx}{iiii}$ *xii egrotis de morbo regis curatis xvis*. This item shows that the hundred and ninety-two people here mentioned received a penny each when they were healed by the king. Gilbertus Anglicus, a physician of the early thirteenth century, tells us that the disease was called 'the king's evil' because it was cured by the king, and in this he is followed by John of Gaddesden, Fellow of Merton College and physician to Edward II. Gaddesden was evidently familiar with cases where the king's touch failed to cure, for in his *Rosa Anglica*, one of the earliest books on medicine by an Englishman, after recommending weasels' blood and pigeons' dung, he says that if these fail the patient ought to go to the king to be touched by him, and if the king's touch does not cure, the patient is to be handed over to the surgeon (Lib. ii, c. i). The Wardrobe Accounts for the tenth year of Edward II (1316) contain items which show that this king touched, among other places, at Lincoln, Tadcaster and York, and the corresponding accounts in Edward III's reign show the king similarly employed. From the middle of the fourteenth century a remarkable change takes place, for there is no mention of the king's evil in the Royal Accounts until the reign of Henry VII. It is true that Sir John Fortescue, the great English lawyer, implies in a book written in 1462 that the practice was still going on, but it must have fallen off very much. Was this due to the Black Death which appeared in 1348? That calamity, which swept away at least one-third of the population, was followed by frequent outbreaks of plague. Perhaps the king, fearing infection, touched less frequently. Perhaps the improvement in social conditions amongst the labouring classes which followed the Black Death diminished

the amount of disease. Be that as it may, the fact remains that we have no record in this period of a king touching for the evil until we come to the reign of Henry VII.

Hitherto there appears to have been no religious service connected with the ceremony; the king merely touched the sick man, blessed him and gave him alms. But a change was introduced by Henry VII, for in his reign a service was drawn up and as part of the ceremonial a gold coin, called an angel noble, was suspended round the neck of the sick person. The service was in Latin, although the rubrics were in English, and was largely derived from a service then in use, *Exorcismus adversus Spiritus Immundos*. After the opening Confession and Absolution, the Gospel (*Mark* xvi, 14 to the end) was read, and during the reading of the Gospel the sick were presented by the Clerk of the Closet and the King touched the sore places whilst the words . . . *super egros manus imponent, et bene habebunt* were being read. The Chaplain continued to repeat the words so long as the king was touching. Then, in the words of the rubric,

> 'This done, the Chaplain shall make an end of the Gospel; and in the meantime the Chirurgeon shall lead away the sick person from the King.'

The Chaplain then read a second Gospel (*St. John* i, 1-14) and the sick were again presented one by one, and when the words *Erat lux vera* were read the King made the sign of the cross with an angel noble over the sore, and the gold coin was then suspended round the sufferer's neck to be worn until he was 'full whole.' *Sit nomen Domini benedictum*, said the Chaplain, and the King replied *Ex hoc, nunc, et usque in saeculum*. Then followed a collect, and the service concluded with a longer prayer to be said by the king at his pleasure, after the sick person had departed.

The second change introduced by Henry VII was the practice of hanging a gold coin about the patient's neck. This coin, called an angel noble because it had on the obverse the figure of St. Michael the Archangel piercing a dragon, was first issued by Edward VI in 1465, and both the figure of St. Michael on the obverse and the legend round the ship on the reverse suggest that this coin was intended, from its first issue, for use at the healing ceremony. For St. Michael was one of the healing saints, having succeeded Apollo in that attribute, and the legend *Per cruce' tua' salva nos* Xρe *Rede'* (obviously abbreviated from *Per tuam crucem salva nos, Christe Redemptor, qui mortem nostram moriendo destruxisti et vitam resurgendo reparasti, Alleluya*, from the Sarum Breviary) would be particularly suitable for a coin issued for use at the service of healing. The service does not seem to have been very popular in Henry VII's days, for the Account Book of the Treasurer of the Chamber shows that in twenty-two months only

thirteen people were touched. Nor did the service attain any marked popularity in Henry VIII's reign, and it is very doubtful whether Edward VI touched at all. Queen Mary, on the other hand, carried out the ceremony most punctiliously, and the service which she used, together with that for the Blessing of Cramp Rings, is in her beautifully illuminated *Manual* which is now in the possession of Westminster Cathedral. The Queen also changed the legend on the angel noble, substituting for the original words *A Dno' Factu' Est Istud z Est Mirabi' in Ocul' Nri'* (*Ps.* cxviii, 23).

We have traced the history of this superstition to the days of the Reformation and might well have expected that, like many other mediaeval superstitions, it would then have died out and be remembered only as a curious practice of the later Middle Ages. But far from dying out it acquired a new importance in the reign of Elizabeth, and was destined to achieve its greatest popularity under the Stuarts. Elizabeth revived the service, probably in English, and miraculous power was confidently claimed for her by the famous surgeon William Clowes. Clowes, surgeon at St. Bartholomew's, was also Surgeon to the Queen and afterwards Sergeant-Surgeon to James I. In 1602 he published *A right fruitful and approved Treatise for the artificial cure of that malady called in Latin Struma and in English the Evil, cured by Kings and Queens of England.* After relating a cure by the Queen's touch, he adds:

> 'And here I do confidently affirm and stedfastly believe that (for the certain cure of this most miserable malady) when all arts and sciences do fail, her Highness is the only day-star, peerless and without comparison,' and then adds the wish 'that she may for ever reign over us (if it please the Lord God) even unto the end of the world, still to cure and to heal many thousands more than ever she hath yet done' (p. 50).

Clowes was the most famous surgeon of his day, but in these words do we not hear the voice of the Elizabethan courtier rather than that of the famous surgeon?

A story which illustrates the political importance of the Queen's magical gift is told by Dr. Tooker. Tooker was Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, Canon of Exeter and afterwards Dean of Litchfield. In 1597 he wrote his book *Charisma sive Donum Sanationis*, the first detailed account which we have of the service. He tells us that many people from all parts of England were cured by the touch of the Queen, and relates how a certain Roman Catholic (probably a Recusant) had been put into prison and had developed king's evil. The physicians failed to cure him, but when he was brought to the Queen and touched by her, he was cured. Thereupon the Roman Catholic was in a dilemma. As a good Romanist he was bound to believe that the Queen, who had been excommunicated, was no true queen. On the other hand, it was obvious that as he had been cured by the Queen's touch, the papal excom-

munication had no power.

> 'He was now satisfied by experimental proof that the Pope's excommunication of Her Majesty signified nothing, since she still continued blessed with so miraculous a quality.'

The propaganda value of this story at a time when Roman Catholics were refusing to acknowledge Elizabeth as the true queen is obvious.

The miraculous power was bequeathed by the Queen to her successor, James I. I say 'bequeathed' for no Scottish king had ever claimed the magic gift, and it was only after considerable hesitation and after being convinced that it was one of the prerogatives of the English crown that he must not give up, that he consented to continue the practice. Out of deference to Puritan feelings he ceased to make the sign of the cross over the ulcers, and it was in his reign there appeared the first of the royal proclamations concerning the times when the miracle would be worked, for on March 25th, 1616, a proclamation forbade patients to approach His Majesty during the summer. To King James' reign belongs Shakespeare's well-known description of the ceremony in *Macbeth* iv, 3. The scene is laid at the court of Edward the Confessor, where Malcolm and Macduff meet. A doctor enters and tells Malcolm that 'a crew of wretched souls' are waiting to be cured by the king. Macduff asks what the disease is, and Malcolm replies:

> ''Tis called the evil;
> A most miraculous work in this good king;
> Which often since my here-remain in England
> I have seen him do. How he solicits heaven,
> Himself best knows; but strangely visited people
> All swoln and ulcerous, pitiful to the eye,
> The mere despair of surgery, he cures,
> Hanging a golden stamp about their necks
> Put on with holy prayer; and 'tis spoken,
> To the succeeeding royalty he leaves
> The healing benediction.'

It is obvious that Shakespeare in the last two lines is paying a subtle compliment to King James, although in the words 'Hanging a golden stamp about their necks' he attributes to Edward the Confessor a practice which did not begin until the reign of Henry VII.

Charles I, as might be expected, fostered the superstition, for was it not a practice which fitted in well with his notion of the divine right of kings? Not only in his palace at Whitehall, but in different parts of England the king performed the miracle. Whilst on his way to Scotland for his coronation in 1633 the king stayed at Durham, where he touched for the evil in the hall of the castle, and after his coronation in Edinburgh on June 18th cured a hundred patients at Holyrood. But the most remarkable miracle

which Charles I performed took place towards the end of his life. In December, 1648, he was conveyed as a prisoner from Hurst Castle in Dorset to Windsor and passed through Winchester. In this city was an innkeeper, John Cole, landlord of 'The Catherine Wheel,' who was suffering from king's evil and for whom the physicians could do nothing. He tried to approach the King, but was driven back by the guards. Flinging himself on his knees, he implored the King's help and cried 'God save the King.' The King, moved with compassion, replied: 'Friend, I see that thou art not permitted to come near me, and I cannot tell what thou wouldst have, but God bless thee and grant thy desire.' Immediately the illness vanished, the blotches and tumours disappeared from the patient and appeared in the man's medicine bottle, which began to swell within and without! This extraordinary story is not a legend from the life of some mediaeval saint, but a story vouched for by Dr. John Nicholas, Warden of New College 1675-1679, and afterwards Warden of Winchester, in a letter written in 1683 to John Browne, Surgeon-in-Ordinary to Charles II.

Although we are concerned only with the history of healing by the royal touch, it may not be irrelevant to mention miracles of healing performed by the royal blood. After the execution of Charles I it was found that handkerchiefs which had been dipped in the blood of the King possessed the same miraculous power as the touch of the King, and Richard Wiseman, Sergeant-Surgeon to Charles II, in his *Chirurgical Treatises*, 1676 (p. 276), declares that many hundreds had derived benefits from the blood of King Charles. One therapeutic relic of the royal martyr had a most unfortunate experience. John Ashburnham, who attended the King on the scaffold, obtained possession of his shirt stained with his royal blood. This shirt, which is still carefully treasured by the family at Ashburnham Park, Sussex, was in frequent demand for the cure of king's evil. In the early 19th century Lady Ashburnham, on her return from Italy, asked the housekeeper if the shirt was safe. 'Quite safe, my lady,' replied the housekeeper, 'and as it was so stained I washed it before I put it away.'

It was in the reign of Charles II that this superstition reached the height of its popularity. The royalist reaction which followed the Commonwealth exalted the office of kingship, and in the first four years after the Restoration Charles II touched no less than 24,000 patients. He revived the practice immediately after his return to England, for Pepys records in his diary under June 23rd, 1660:

> '. . . the poor people were forced to stand all the morning in the rain in the garden and afterwards he touched them in the Banqueting House.'

The ceremonial which was followed and the service that was used varied little from that of Henry VII, although the service was, of

course, in English; but Charles II altered the legend on the angel noble (which henceforth became a 'touch-piece' and was used only for this purpose) to *Soli Deo Gloria.*[1]

We have a detailed account of touching for the evil from the pen of John Browne, Surgeon-in-Ordinary to the King and surgeon at St. Thomas' Hospital. In 1684 he published *Adenochoiradalogia*, which consists of three parts, and the third part is called *Charisma Basilicon, or The Royal Gift of Healing*. In it he gives an account of the ceremony in which he had often taken part, as he was one of the surgeons appointed to examine the patients, for only those who had been passed by the surgeons and to whom the surgeons gave a ticket could approach the king to be healed.

A few extracts from *Charisma Basilicon* will suffice to show this surgeon's faith in the miraculous power of the king:

> '. . . this Healing Vertue of our Dread Sovereigns, in which action he appears as the Soul to the Body; and is seen to maintain his three Nations in Health as well as Peace. . . . his Sacred Hands are sweetened with that sacred Salutiferous gift of Healing. . . . And because I have been oft conversant and attending at many of these laudable operations, having waited on his Sacred Person both at publick and at private Healings, as one of his meanest Chirurgeons, where I have seen many thousands of poor Souls touched and cured by his Sacred Hands (and as a particular account hath lately been given in which he hath healed above Six Thousand this very last year) I am obliged both by duty and conscience to give my faith to his Royal Touch, seeing the daily and innumerable effects thereof; many of which as if amazed at the speedy farewell of their Diseases have immediately been cured to admiration, even in the Presence, before they have gone out of the Banquetting-house at White-hall where his Majesty doth most usually heal; and some although brought in lame and blind, yet have within a very little and short space of time recovered their limbs and gained their sight, as will plentifully be made good by divers Examples in our last chapter. . . . I shall ever affirm, that all Chirurgeons whatsoever must truckle to the same, and come short of all his marvellous method of Healing; and for further manifestation hereof, I do humbly presume to assert that more Souls have been healed by his Majesties Sacred Hand in one year, than have ever been cured by all the Physicians and Chirurgeons of his three Kingdoms ever since his Happy Restoration' '(p. 81).

Similar testimony to the king's miraculous power is given by Wiseman, Sergeant-Surgeon to the King:

> 'I myself have been a frequent eyewitness of many hundreds of cures performed by his Majesties' touch alone, without any assistance of chirurgery,' and he adds that the king 'cureth more in one year than all the chirurgeons of London have done in an age.'

Sir Thomas Brown, author of *Religio Medici*, was a believer in this superstition, and it is noteworthy that amongst the vulgar errors exposed by him in his *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* there is no mention of touching for the king's evil. In fact, a story related in

[1] Charles I had already altered the legend to *Amor Populi Praesidium Regis*. Truly a strange motto for one who believed that he ruled by divine right!

John Browne's *Charisma Basilicon* (p. 187) not only illustrates Sir Thomas Brown's belief in the superstition but also shows the political use to which belief in the gift was put. The little daughter of a Norfolk Noncomformist had developed king's evil and Sir Thomas Brown recommended that she should be touched. The father refused to allow it, declaring that he had no belief in the king's touch nor in the Church of England. But friends of the child under pretence of taking her for a change of air took her to Breda, where Charles was living, and there had her touched and she was cured. When she returned and the delighted father learned how his child had been cured, he forthwith changed his religion and his politics. He became a convert to the Church of England, crying out: 'Farewell to all dissenters and Nonconformists.' The political value of the story at a time when many were opposed to church and king is obvious.

Not the least important part of Browne's *Charisma Basilicon* is the appendix, which contains the numbers touched by Charles II from May 1660 to May 1682, with the exception of the years 1665 and 1666, the years of the Great Plague and of the Fire of London. The number of persons recorded to have been touched in those twenty-one years amounts to the astounding total of 92,107. The prayer for the Parliament composed in the reign of Charles II speaks of 'the High Court of Parliament under our most religious and gracious king.' Surely a truer description would be 'under our most profligate and immoral king,' and it is interesting to note that no person in the world's history is recorded to have worked so many miracles as this our most profligate and immoral king. Attempts have been made to canonize Charles I; but surely Charles II, in view of the astounding number of miracles which he worked and which are attested by contemporary evidence, has far stronger claims to canonization than his father.

The king's popularity increased towards the end of his reign, and with his popularity the number of people seeking to be touched by him increased, so that in 1682 no less than 8,577 were touched. A Royal Proclamation in 1626, followed from time to time by similar Proclamations, had already limited the seasons when patients might be touched, and had commanded the sufferers to bring with them a certificate from the minister of the parish testifying that they had not already been touched. In January 1683/4 Charles issued a Proclamation repeating the contents of former Proclamations, but adding that the minister of the parish must keep a register of all the certificates which he granted. It is this last Proclamation which explains the entries in Waterperry Parish Register to which attention has already been drawn.[2]

[2] The present writer would be glad to receive a postcard from any incumbent who finds a similar entry in his register, giving the date of the entry.

The cost of the journey to London to be touched must have been considerable, and sometimes sufferers received grants towards their expenses. Thus the churchwardens of Ecclesfield record in 1641 :

> 'Given to John Parkin's wife towards her travell to London to get cure of the Evill which her son Thom is visited with all 0·6·8';

and the town records of Preston for 1684 have the entry :

> 'The bailiffs ordered to pay 10/- to a bricklayer to take his son to London to be touched.'

It would appear that some even crossed the Atlantic for that purpose, for there is still preserved in the records of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, a petition presented in 1687 asking the Assembly of that Province to grant assistance to a sufferer who desired to make the long journey to England.

A notice appeared in *The London Gazette* for October 7th, 1686, announcing that James II would heal weekly on Fridays and commanding the attendance of the King's Physicians and Surgeons to examine patients and deliver tickets. Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, a great friend of James II, records in his diary that on August 28th, 1687, James healed 350 people; and Anthony Wood relates that the King when he visited Oxford touched between 700 and 800 in the Cathedral. That the miraculous gift had a political value is again made evident in this reign, for one of the charges preferred against the Duke of Monmouth after his rebellion was that he had touched for the king's evil. William III refused to touch.

> 'He had,' says Macaulay, 'too much sense to be duped and too much honesty to bear a part in what he knew to be an imposture. "It is a silly superstition," he exclaimed when he learnt that at the close of Lent his palace was besieged by a crowd of the sick. On one occasion he was importuned into laying his hand on a patient. "God give you better health," he said, "and more sense." It was because of his unbelief in the superstition that many High Churchmen put him down as "either an infidel or a Puritan."'

The last of our monarchs to take part in this mummery was the good Queen Anne. Although she herself was probably not inclined to it, the strength of royalist feeling doubtless compelled her to carry on the practice. Crippled as she was with gout, the act of touching must have been painful to her, but she touched even at Bath whither she had gone for her health. For the touching she used a lodestone, no doubt believing in its therapeutic properties for the ancient tradition which ascribes healing virtue to the lodestone can be traced back to Aetius, a Greek physician of the sixth century A.D. Her lodestone is now preserved in the Wellcome Museum of the History of Medicine. Amongst those touched by Queen Anne was little Samuel Johnson, then two and a half years old. The touch does not appear to have been successful, for Dr.

Johnson was long deprived of the use of one eye owing to scrofula. The touch-piece which he received on that occasion is still preserved in the British Museum. The service was considerably shortened by Queen Anne, one Gospel being read instead of two, and the patient was presented only once. In this shortened form the service was inserted into the Book of Common Prayer, but by whose authority it is impossible to say. The service had, indeed, appeared in some Prayer Books as early as 1634 and again in 1662, but from 1707 it was printed regularly in the Prayer Book and the last edition to contain it appeared as late as 1732, long after the touching for the king's evil had ceased in England. The exiled Stuarts continued to touch, and touch-pieces given by Bonnie Prince Charlie, bearing the title Charles III, may be seen in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, where are also some of his brother, Cardinal York, the last of the Stuarts, bearing the empty title Henry IX.

No account of touching for the king's evil would be complete without some estimate of the amount of truth in this ancient superstition. That *some* cases were cured is undeniable. The preparations for seeing the king, the impressive service, the thrill produced by the touch of the royal hand, the hopes raised by the wearing of the amulet would all combine to rouse strong emotions which might well have produced physiological changes in the body of a stimulating and beneficial kind, and it is not impossible that these may have resulted in real cures. But were all the cases that were cured cases of scrofula? Scrofula was a term almost as vague as leprosy, and many who were believed to be suffering from it were probably suffering from nothing more than impetigo, pediculosis, itch or some other 'dirt' disease. The wash and change of shirt which no doubt preceded the patient's presentation to the king, together with the change of air which the journey entailed, would account in many cases for the disappearance of the disease. Moreover, from Elizabethan days, those seeking to be touched had to be examined by the royal surgeons first, and only such as were passed were touched by the king. Is it likely that the surgeons passed cases which they thought incurable? But it may be urged that some men whose honesty and intelligence cannot be doubted believed in the miracle. True, but do not some men, whose honesty and intelligence cannot be doubted, believe in the most absurd superstitions to-day? Do we not find even retired admirals and generals amongst those who believe in the British Israelite nonsense? Are there not perfectly respectable citizens who believe in astrology to-day? If we consider the amount of superstition and credulity which survives in our own time we shall not wonder at their prevalence in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

'IF A MAN DIE . . .'

By the Rev. Canon J. S. Bezzant, B.D., M.A., Chaplain, R.N.V.R., Chancellor of Liverpool Cathedral.

'IF immortality be untrue,' wrote Buckle, 'it matters little whether anything else be true or not.' 'That man,' said Goethe, 'is dead even in this life who has no belief in any other.' These represent the inevitable judgment of thoughtful men; and certainly the Christian religion is so bound up with the immortal hope as to stand or fall with it. Dr. Jacks' recent confession that it is the theme of the whole of the New Testament is exaggeration, but is not misleading. And I quote the following from one of the most open-minded and fascinating books I have ever read:

> 'Think, if only for a moment, think. Proclaim to men that "Death is the only immortal," and religion receives its mortal wound. Announce to them that all human history is a mere scramble for wealth or power, all loves and loyalties time's broken pottery — it is ruin, and every man knows it. Men will not be easily consoled for so much courage, so much endurance, so much faith, so much affection, so much sweetness cast into the void, when they recall the faithful hearts, friendly faces, strong intelligences for ever gone, when they remember the mother's weeping for their children snatched away. And palsied slaves they would be if they accepted these enormities with pious resignation or praised the gods any more. If the world in its scientific wisdom banishes humanity's larger hope, for all your excellent inventions, your alleviations of discomfort and disease, for all your wise saws and platitudes, the "Never, never, never, never, never" of Lear will make of earth's pleasures a make-believe, and a sense of suffocation invade all thoughtful breasts.'[1]

The human story affords no stranger psychological fact than the deliberate refusal to accept a cardinal condition of existence: for nothing is more plainly 'finished' than the dead body of a formerly living creature, particularly when it has been some time dead. In spite of this, and the total absence of any empirical sign of continued life, mankind generally has refused to accept death as the end of man.

But in modern days a great change has come, and among peoples profoundly influenced by the Gospel that 'brought life and immortality to light.' Nearly half a century ago an acute observer noted the almost complete disappearance of 'the other world' as the most startling change in Christian preaching during his lifetime. In and after the last war there was some but no very great revival of interest in life after death, and a not inconsiderable resort to the succours of Spiritualism. It is otherwise now. The question of immortality arouses surprisingly little interest. The road to Endor still has its sad travellers, but it is not crowded.

[1] *The Human Situation*. Gifford Lectures, by W. Macneile Dixon (pp. 424*f*.).

with refugees from faith's heavenly Jerusalem. Some months ago circumstances led to my receiving nearly four hundred letters from anxious relatives of naval men reported 'missing' after a disaster which left no hope that the missing survived. I was deeply impressed by two facts. First, a very large number of the letters made some reference to God and to religion, and almost without exception these assumed it to be incredible that God could have allowed some loved one to die. Religion seemed to be a form of insurance against what it is natural for the human heart to dread, whether with or without religion. *One* bereaved mother wrote: 'I also believe that God loves him better even than we do, and I am content to leave him, whether in life or in death, to His merciful will.' But no other of those letters gave the least indication that belief in a life beyond death had any place in the writers' sorrow.

Reasons for the great change are various and familiar. The ages-old pictures of Hell and Heaven long ago lost all living verisimilitude; the present mature generation has never known what it meant to take them seriously. If they are thought about at all, the one incites to mockery while the symbolism and imagery of the other suggest nothing that healthy, active men and women desire: if Hell offends, Heaven bores. Moreover for common thought tinctured by science but not by philosophy, man is primarily the body, and it seems far more obvious that the mind depends upon the body than that the body is greatly affected by the mind; and as the resurrection of the body, understood to mean the resuscitation of the flesh, is incredible, belief in immortality withers. Then a vicious circle is set up. The belief that temporal acts have eternal issues gave dignity and a sense of responsibility to human life which in time are degraded when the belief decays. The Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, in his book before us,[2] indicates a long-standing disease of modern life:

> 'Once man has lost belief in himself, then he cannot trust his own word; he will give up expectation; he may become more philanthropic but it will be out of sentiment and not principle; he will all too easily become part of a gang or mob, and his ideal will be an unworried, secure and not too responsible existence upon this earth. His belief in an after-life will range from sheer incredulity to a vague hope that kindness is all and that everybody will end up safely in a comfortable heaven' (p. 103).

Now it is important to note that modern lack of interest and unbelief in immortality are not the result of reasoned arguments against it. Indeed, large numbers of people are little influenced by any reasoning which has more than one step in it, and they find it easy to credit many things which have no ground in reason at all. But precisely because it is so, the *psychological impressiveness*

[2] *Death and Life*, by the Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. (Longmans, pp. 180; price 5*s*. net.)

of all that tells against the resurrection of the flesh is the more effective, for no sort of immortality apart from the body can easily *be pictured*. The prevailing state of mind is psychologically—not rationally or reasonably—induced. Consequently I see no likelihood of any great change in the modern outlook on this subject, which in turn affects the whole attitude to religion, except on one or both of two conditions. One is that evidence of survival, such as would pass exacting scientific tests, should be forthcoming; this, while not proving the Christian doctrine, would produce a psychological condition very favourable to it, such as at present does not exist. The second prerequisite is a recovery of trust in what is reasonable as the surest guide to truth.

It needs not to emphasize that Fr. D'Arcy's book is outstanding for its control and presentation of material and for its lucid style. It is obviously the work of a very acute mind, who knows the world in which he is living. He claims no originality. How novel it may appear to those who read only approved Roman Catholic literature is, perhaps, not for me to say, but those who read the best Anglican writers will find much in it with which they have long been familiar. What is truly remarkable is the fact that, except for its title-page and an occasional paragraph and turn of phrase, few would recognize it as the work of a distinguished Roman Catholic and Jesuit.

Of spiritualistic phenomena Fr. D'Arcy has nothing to say except to indicate the importance of distinguishing between the assertions of spiritualists and the evidence which is controlled and tested by independent experts, which may in time, he thinks, receive a rational explanation. The familiar Catholic view that mediumistic phenomena are the work of evil spirits is not mentioned. The author has read Dr. C. D. Broad and is no doubt aware of the ridicule which such an explanation invites. We are also told frankly that

> 'the child's picture of paradise has done much to scandalize educated minds and make them sceptical. . . . Their scepticism by a natural process tends to embrace not only the form of life after death but the very existence of it' (p. 2).

And, while insisting that we cannot do without symbols and images, he writes:

> 'We risk talking foolishness when we have recourse to imagery and metaphor. There is imagery which degrades and imagery which enlightens, metaphor which has lost its vigour and relevance and metaphor which can give a relish. Choirs and crowns and palms and white robes once meant much as images, but now they are too like the plaster statuary of St. Sulpice. Even the Scriptural imagery, unless the writer meant it to be taken seriously, can become antiquated and repellent' (p. 127).

t is, we may feel, the official Roman Catholic doctrine of Scripture hich requires the qualification, which is certainly not a factual ne, in the last foregoing sentence.

The book is divided into two nearly equal parts. The first is in ne main an examination (so far as is relevant to the main subject) f the nature of the human self : the second expounds the Christian octrine of the after-life.

The analysis and argument in the first part are inductive and, ithin the limits of a short treatise, could hardly be more con- incing — except at the crucial point. There, as it appears to me, n entirely unjustified leap is made. Though obviously independ- nt, the reasoning resembles the much more thorough exposition n the earlier chapters of Dr. Tennant's *Philosophical Theology*. his section is of great importance because Fr. D'Arcy's conclu- ion is that the fact of survival, as distinct from the mode of it, is certainty; and he often repeats this claim which is, of course, an ncient one.

The argument is, in outline, as follows: Death means the issolution of our bodies. New knowledge has not spanned the hasm between mind and matter though it may modify our theory f their relations. There is also a gulf between animal intelligence nd human reason. The mind is radically different from matter nd independent of it. The mystic experiences disclose certain eal activities of the soul :

> 'All must, whether they like it or not, accept this singular fact—namely, that the soul, by defying the body, does not necessarily decay. So far from that, a new life, authentic or illusory does not matter, shows itself unmistakably. If the soul were material that simply could not happen' (p. 57).[3]

The existence of something radically immaterial is proved by the act of abstract thoughts and systems of them :

> 'The astonishing feature of human intelligence is that it apparently serves as a camera might serve to bring out the character of nature and other beings. It is worthy of the praise which St. Paul gives to charity. It is not self-seeking ; it attends to other things for what they are in themselves irrespective of their relations to our private wants' (p. 48).

The reasoning proceeds :

> 'The primal argument for immortality is based on the fact that mind and matter are opposites. It is matter which perishes. . . . The shapes and forms which matter takes are all composite, a unity of parts. When the parts begin to fall away dissolution follows. . . . Only the mind and its subject can survive because the law of dissolution does not hold for it. . . . We think of death as the close of our temporal story, but in

[3] Fr. D'Arcy mentions the view that the soul is half way between body and pirit, or the thinking subject; but he writes, 'The view, however, that soul nd spirit are one . . . has become so prevalent that we usually pay no atten- ion to this ancient distinction' (p. 83).

> reality it is the decay, the falling apart, of the elements which make up our bodily organism. Death can have no meaning when applied to what is immaterial. . . . Imagine taking the mind to pieces, as one might a clock, dismantling it as one would a room. Because of the unsuitability of such a metaphor we use an image which suggests suddenness and total obliteration. We speak of the mind as like a candle which is lit and can be extinguished, or a breath which is and is not' (p. 35).

The conclusion and, as it seems to me, the legitimate conclusion from the facts and reasoning thus briefly indicated, can be stated in the author's words used earlier in his argument:

> 'What is free from material conditions cannot be subject to the laws of matter; but it is matter which dissolves at death; therefore what is not conditioned by matter *need not* dissolve at death' (p. 9).[4]

But Fr. D'Arcy now concludes more than this, and it is herein that he makes the unwarranted leap; 'need not dissolve at death' is one conclusion, but that 'Mind is indissoluble and cannot die. Its immortality is therefore assured,' is a further and unjustified inference. That I need not get drunk is proved by the fact that I don't: that I cannot get drunk may be false. Fr. D'Arcy produces no argument at all to prove his transition from 'need not' to 'cannot': it is sheer assertion; at most the substitution of a psychological certitude for logical or reasonable certainty, while claiming the latter. He even admits that the mind, being finite, can in theory be annihilated, because 'what is finite is dependent upon something else';

> 'it has not the final say within itself as to what it may be, and shall be, and this is why, in Christian theology, the immortality which belongs to spirit by nature could, it is admitted, be taken away from it by a direct act of God,' but 'there is not the least likelihood that God should unmake what He has made' (p. 37).

This is, indeed, a most reasonable inference from ethical Theism but Fr. D'Arcy maintains the natural immortality of the soul as a philosophical certainty; it is not, for him, an inference from Theism but a fact which only God can unmake.

Prior to the establishment of ethical Theism, it is quite reasonably open to anyone to say that, whatever the nature of the soul as it is known in relation with the body, it *may* vanish or be extinguished on the death of the body or later; that whatever power or forces produce what we call the soul can and may also annihilate it. That 'for all we know there may be all manner of possibilities which we cannot conceive' (p. 41) is a consideration to which Fr. D'Arcy himself can appeal when it suits him in escaping a 'conclusion which looks almost inevitable.' The unbeliever can also

[4] I have italicised the all-important words. The argument would still be legitimate if it were more accurately stated thus: What is *to a considerable extent* free from material conditions cannot be subject to *all* the laws of matter; but it is matter which dissolves at death; therefore what is not *wholly* conditioned by matter *need not* dissolve at death.

appeal to it, and no one can extract certainty out of ignorance. The author in fact does what in another connexion he warns us against when he says:

> 'Our abstract conceptions turn into nouns and then solidify' (he might have said the same of adjectival qualities) 'and by the unwary they are thought of as existing in their own right' (p. 39).

Abstract truths of reason are eternal and immortal, but the human soul is not an abstract truth but an actuality. Fr. D'Arcy's certainty is derived from an association of ideas; but whether the human soul continues to exist after the death of the body is not a question of the linkage of definitions and ideas but a question of fact, and one which the facts available do not enable us to answer positively. The empirical facts and what may reasonably be deduced from them about the soul's continued existence after death leave room for faith and for faith's certitude, but they afford no proof and therefore no certainty. Fr. D'Arcy's certainty is dogma about the unknown.

The immortality which is thus wrongly regarded as proved reveals nothing, Fr. D'Arcy admits, about its nature, being 'little more than a negative conclusion.' On the larger issue there is the division of opinion which he designates the Platonic view and the Peripatetic. According to the one, the ideal immortality is that in which the soul sheds the body as an encumbrance; this view, though given short shrift in certain periods, never disappears and is deeply rooted in human nature (p. 77). The other view he regards as more satisfying to the claims of experience. According to it 'the body is a refractory friend and as essential for our humanity as the spirit' (p. 79). Alone, the spirit is no longer human; without the body it is not complete and can never enjoy its humanity.

> 'When we try to untie the various parts of our self and dissociate the spiritual from the physical we are hard put to it to set any boundary mark. The two seem to overlap in the most extraordinary way' (p. 78).

In reasoning independently of the Christian religion Fr. D'Arcy finds 'no argument which can help us to believe in the continued existence or resuscitation of the body' (p. 41). But there is no great difficulty in supposing that the spirit, when separated from the body, retains the knowledge and experience it has gained, including wisdom and love; and, as St. Thomas Aquinas teaches, being free of the body, it may then receive more easily the influences from other discarnate intelligences, and our present mode of understanding be replaced by another and higher mode. This, of course, is speculation, but it is reasonable speculation. What is quite useless is to appeal to one set of theologically-generated mysteries to illumine other mysteries. Theologians have distin-

guished three kinds of knowledge possessed by Christ: a constant intuition of the Divine essence or the Beatific vision, a supernatural knowledge, and knowledge, like ours, gained in his earthly life. For Fr. D'Arcy, of course, this is not, as it is for us, speculation upon what is beyond all knowledge, but a fact concluded from Revelation. What we cannot understand, he says, is how these three forms of knowledge co-existed, but that they did so shows how many possibilities are beyond our ken. In the same way 'the dogmas of the risen Body of Christ and the Eucharist' are regarded as a warrant for certain knowledge 'that a body can be very unlike all that we have experienced' (p. 84). Those who feel that theological puzzles such as these throw light upon life after death are not likely to need any arguments, Fr. D'Arcy's or others', to induce conviction or to confirm faith.

More illuminating as to what may be possible is the familiar illustration by which the author shows that everlasting life need not mean a monotonous continuance for ever at the same level of experience, or simply the life of the body and of the senses measured by an endless succession of moments. This he calls 'the horizontal state of living,' and it may be one condition of lost souls. The 'vertical' state is indicated by the experience of 'losing ourselves' and all sense of the passing of time when with friends or in a book or in ecstasy. Eternal life is marked by quality, intensity, unconsciousness of time; the aspiring, the spiritual and the unifying tend to be timeless in our experience even while yet in the body.

We turn to the exposition of 'The Christian Doctrine of the After-Life.' Here are some surprises. Apart from an occasional use of the language of Scripture as Revelation conveying knowledge above criticism, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that these chapters contain little that could not have been written by liberal theologians of our own Church. What we are wont to regard as the crudities and superstitions which commonly surround Catholic teaching about the Supernatural, Purgatory, Heaven, Hell and the Resurrection of the Body have no place in these pages. They are not denied; they are passed over in silence. Perhaps they are in mind when we are told at the outset that 'there has always been a wall of division between the learned and the simple even in the acceptance of the same belief. . . . So sharply are these two classes separated' that, in some religions, the inner truth is supposed to be reserved for an élite while the common people are allowed to remain in superstition. Then we read:

> 'That the Christian religion has always escaped this danger would be a hazardous claim. But it is certainly true that Catholic authority tries to subordinate all devotion to doctrine and refuses to allow emotion or fancy to run away with the truth to be taught. Once the truth of the doctrine

however, has been put on the top of the page the church gives its members the freedom to embellish it to their heart's content, and it is this which explains the extravagance and conceits of, for instance, the medieval craftsmen. Again, in the Catholic panorama of the after-life the image is realized as an image, and no more' (pp. 97*f*.).

Such a passage suggests comments which may seem hostile, though they are not made merely 'of contention.' I cannot claim knowledge of what Catholic authority *tries* to do; but what, in this matter, it actually succeeds in doing suggests that its efforts are of little avail, which is surprising in view of what it can effect when it is exerted in other ways. Are announcements of Spanish bullfights as held under the special patronage of the Blessed Virgin instances of 'embellishing'? If so, what might be expected as an instance of allowing the 'common people to remain in superstition'? Are the booklets made available in Roman Catholic churches to explain the truth about Purgatory, Heaven and Hell merely further instances of the 'freedom to embellish'? And does the truth of the doctrine 'put on the top of the page' really affect the beliefs and practices of the faithful to a degree comparable with the influence of the embellishments? In the oecumenical Creeds and in our own Church there has never been on the top of the page any doctrine of the verbal inspiration and infallibility of Holy Scripture, but what other single doctrine has had a comparable influence upon belief and practice? And as I have studied discussions on Reunion I have sometimes thought the solution might be found in a revision of the Creed so that it should begin 'I believe in Bishops'; for the proportion of the faith being thus placed beyond cavil, the new article of the Creed might come to assume the same degree of importance in Reunion discussions as is now accorded to the present first article. Further, that 'in the Catholic panorama of the after-life the image is realized as an image, and no more'—by Fr. D'Arcy no doubt, by all the learned perhaps, but by the multitude, including the half-educated who have never been allowed to think freely and who are Catholics because it was impossible for them to be anything else, and who do not even know what questions to ask, who can assert it?

Men naturally hesitate to apply 'holiness' to human character in this life; its attainment in spite of hard effort, perhaps for all but a few, lies far beyond the present life. Fr. D'Arcy has illuminating things to say about it. I quote only one:

> 'We have no need to concentrate all our attention on what we love; the loved object works the miracle of itself. Three features of any intense experience, therefore, are to the point here. The first is that the determining factor in intense experience is the object loved; the second, that this object unifies our experience in such a way that we grow unconscious of time; and the third is that our experience is heightened and our self grows to the likeness of the object of our desire' (p. 107).

On approaching a chapter headed 'The Supernatural' I was prepared to encounter the most uncompromising insistence upon the miraculous in relation to immortality. Instead, there is not a paragraph from which a liberal Christian need dissent or that could not have been written (perhaps in more restrained language) by the late Dr. Rashdall, or by Dr. Inge or Dr. Tennant. A few selections will illustrate:

> 'By some hidden providence what is lower in the scale of reality can be lifted above itself by an assimilation to and imitation of what is higher, . . . the touch of the finger of God upon the soul will by its power awaken it to new capacities for love and happiness' (p. 117).

> 'However limited human intelligence is by being ours, it nevertheless is of its nature of illimitable range and can be so suited as to see what is beyond its natural human range. . . . A human mind has no precise boundary, and because of this unique prerogative it can rise to a higher level without a miracle and without destruction of our humanity' (p. 118).

And Fr. D'Arcy quotes the following passage with approval:

> 'The supernatural good is nothing else than the ideal perfection of our spiritual nature; that which realizes in the most perfect manner possible its meaning as a living image of God, which so perfects the natural image of God in the direction in which it ought to seek its perfection, that it acquires completely that beauty and that resemblance to God of which it is naturally capable, and one to which the Creator can summon it without leaving the limits of its nature' (p. 118).

Once more, in the author's own words:

> 'This enlarging of our capacity, this grace which enables us to love God with a love proportionate to His own, is what is called the "supernatural." . . . All our life, therefore, in this world and the next, is determined by this factor of the supernatural' (p. 121).

It must not be supposed that I have overlooked passages of another sort or suppressed them: they are not there. Contrast the one-sided declamations of the Barthians or the reactionary dogmatism of some of our 'younger Catholic theologians' in the Church of England with these chapters of Fr. D'Arcy's book; it is like passing from the artificial heat of a forcing-house of exotics into a healthier and more bracing air. Similarly with what he has to say about Purgatory. He is true to Roman theology that Purgatory is not 'another chance'; its pains are penal, not reformatory, and the eternal destiny of the soul is unalterably fixed at death. Those who are not Roman Catholics may well maintain that here we are outside the limits alike of knowledge and of Revelation, but at least the speculation is all of the nobler form embodied in *The Dream of Gerontius*. Of the darker side, of Papal Indulgences 'applicable also to the souls in Purgatory,' and the rest, which loom largely in ordinary Catholic teaching and practice, there is no word.

As for Hell, 'those who die at enmity with God are damned

for ever' therein. Catholic doctrine, 'which has remained unchanged, scandalizes many.' What, however, is Hell? Here is the author's answer:

> 'Finally, man in his freedom can fight against his own perfection and that intended for him by God. He has the dangerous privilege of co-operating in his own destiny, and if he chooses himself and to remain outside the supernatural order, which is all, animate and inanimate, orientated to God, he will find himself outside the loving disposition of God, meet a creation inimical and no longer co-operative, be left to himself and suffer the lot of a fugitive from love, human and divine. This is what is meant by Hell' (p. 126).

'The fire of Hell,' we are told, 'is the most unpopular and most misunderstood of the church's teaching on the after-life.' We should like to know Fr. D'Arcy's account of how the offence and mistake ever arose; it is not easy to guess if what he teaches is the unchanging Catholic doctrine:

> 'It is supposed that the language implies a material fire such as we know. The thought, however, really moves on another plane. That should be guessed because the word "everlasting" qualifies fire, and fire, as we know it, is a temporal process . . .[5] God is so alive as to be ablaze, . . . and it is natural to think of what is good as lit by his flame into a new brightness and what is evil as being devoured by that same flame' (p. 129).

The 'important theological principle which may be called "economy"' is then introduced:

> 'Just as we have to choose the best time to break bad news, observe the mood of those on whom we jest, put the same truth in a different form according as we address an audience of miners or University professors, so Providence can be found to adapt truth to the recipient's power of receiving it' (p. 130).

Following St. Thomas, Fr. D'Arcy distinguishes between 'a pain of loss' which is infinite and 'a pain of sense' which is finite. The former means 'to be deprived of the friendship of God in utter misery'; the latter 'seems to imply some positive act of chastisement.' There are some pertinent and, I think, sound observations about the motives of punishment, and we are also reminded that we are thinking about the perfect justice of God, not of our human attempts to achieve justice, and that justice never exists alone but lies alongside mercy. The Gospels tell us to fix attention not so much on justice as on love. But because God's love

> 'is so dynamic as to lift the good into a supernatural union with Himself and recreate a body fit for such an ecstasy, it will have a pronounced and positive effect upon what is evil and opposed, shining through it like a fire "reaching to the heart and vitals," permeating sense and spirit' (p. 134).
>
> 'Where there is an unyielding resistance, (the divine) love must mean an excruciating pain to the recipient of it' (p. 135).

[5] But it is natural that the qualification should be overlooked when it is taught that the resurrection bodies of the damned will combine an infinite sensitiveness to pain with an asbestos capacity of endurance.

> 'The divine love is of such infinite voltage that the astonishing thing is that so frail and finite a being as man can endure it' (p. 140).

I do not like these references to the Divine love, which are also prominent in what the author says about life in heaven. I do not find such metaphors in the teaching of Jesus; they are not reflected in the Pauline hymn in praise of love. They seem to me to be much too closely associated with the more violent passional characteristics of human love to be wisely used for the Divine love (even if Fr. D'Arcy intends them merely as metaphors) and, while retaining the word 'love,' to substitute what is much more like a passionate power or force for the *agape* of the New Testament.

The clearest statement I can find of the meaning the author attaches to the 'fire' of Hell is that 'there must be some veritable resemblance between the effect of fire as we know it, and the pain caused by the "fire" of the other world.' If that is what, and all, Catholic theology has always taught, the expression the truth has found in previous centuries has been equally misleading and unfortunate. And Fr. D'Arcy's final comment on the subject is:

> 'When, then, we think of Hell we can assert with confidence that only those who have so resisted divine grace and love as to make their own evil choice final remain in everlasting opposition to divine love and suffer the necessary consequences of that opposition' (p. 141).

I had understood Roman Catholic theology to teach that one who has committed any mortal sin must, if he dies unabsolved, inevitably go to Hell. How this is to be reconciled with the foregoing quotation is far from clear, and Fr. D'Arcy, whose ingenuity is greater than mine, does not help us.

In his final chapter on Heaven there are good suggestions as to how natural joys may there abound, while as the author says, the doctrine of the Communion of Saints means that nothing of good is lost. But it is the doctrine of the resurrection of the body that is claimed as the clue to much that is otherwise puzzling. I have studied this section with much interest because, if there is one doctrine upon which, both in Catholicism and Protestantism (with the exception of a few thinkers regarded as heretical) there has until modern times been practically universal agreement and clear statement, this is that one doctrine. It is a doctrine about which Fr. D'Arcy is capable of plain language, for he has already said that apart from the Christian religion there is no argument 'which can help us to believe in the continued existence or *resuscitation* of the body' (p. 46).[6] But his final exposition, at the crucial point, I do not find clear.

[6] Italics mine. Throughout the last section on this subject I am not sure whether Fr. D'Arcy would or would not allow readers to see a difference between '*a* body' and '*the* body.'

Fr. D'Arcy expounds briefly but fairly St. Paul's language in *I Cor.* xv, and continues:

> 'Nor need there be anything fantastic in supposing a body which is adapted to the new condition of the soul, a body which is a work of art of the soul, and alive with its own supernatural energy and loveliness. St. Paul expressly implies that the body which we shall possess is the effect of a "life-giving spirit." The steps in his argument are that Christ rose from the dead with a glorified body; Christ has given us His own life. This life is a "life-giving spirit," and as His own Body had conferred upon it incorruptibility, so too the new supernatural "life-giving spirit" in us will animate a body fit to function as a co-partner in the uninterrupted, perfect life which it is to enjoy in eternity. To try to give details about the nature of such a body would be absurd, . . . and so far as the conditions of the next life are concerned we have no empirical data of any kind' (p. 175).

But in view of the traditional doctrine of the resurrection of the body the crucial question is, in Fr. D'Arcy's words,

> 'In what sense can this risen body to which we have so far tried to give verisimilitude be called identical with the body which is ours in this life?' (p. 175).

He quotes St. Thomas' statement that

> 'what does not bar numerical identity in a man while he lives on uninterruptedly, clearly can be no bar to the identity of the risen man with the man that was. In a man's body while he lives there are not always the same parts in respect of matter, but only in respect of species. In respect of matter there is a flux and reflux of parts: still that fact does not bar the man's numerical identity from the beginning to the end of his life' (p. 176).

Fr. D'Arcy thinks St. Thomas puts his finger on the relevant point. Despite all changes, a man remains the same *man* with the same *human* body: 'specific identity' is not affected;

> 'What is remarkable is the perseverance of the structure or inscape, the artistry of the soul which converts all that it receives into the form, visible and invisible, which is its own' (p. 176).

Now it seems to me that Fr. D'Arcy has answered a different question than the one he asked. The question was, and is, *not* whether great changes in the body are compatible with a man remaining *the same man* throughout them: it was, and is, whether the body of the resurrection life remains *the same body* as that which undergoes dissolution. All that is said about the powers of the soul over the body and the physical changes which occur in the body while it is still alive is entirely irrelevant in considering whether the dead body laid in the grave is ever to be resuscitated. For throughout the operation of those powers and changes, not only is the soul in such close union with the body that (as the author has already said in another context) 'we are hard put to it to set any boundary mark' (p. 78), but the continuity of new mate-

rial substance with already living material substance persists throughout the whole process. Death ends that process; it is dissolution, decay, involving ultimate reabsorption in other inorganic and living things. The soul's powers over the body, and that changes in the living body do not impair its identity, are therefore nothing to the point in considering the question now before us. I am unable to see that Fr. D'Arcy's teaching means anything more than that there is to be *a* resurrection body 'which is a work of art of the soul,' the principle of continuity and identity with the present *man* being the soul, not the body laid in the grave, or any 'germ' or 'essence' of that body. Many liberal non-Roman Catholic theologians believe this; and if Fr. D'Arcy holds that orthodoxy requires us to believe more than this, it is much to be regretted that he does not say so and tell us what the 'more' is and wherein it consists. Catholic theologians in former ages, including St. Thomas, found no difficulty in doing so, and our author assures us that Catholic doctrine does not change.

In 1921 Dr. Major was accused of heresy in teaching that, in his view, the resurrection meant 'the survival of death by a personality which has shed its physical integument for ever.'[7] In answering the charge he set out two groups of citations; one from the most prominent Christian authors from St. Clement of Rome to St. Thomas Aquinas and from representative writers among the Reformers and their successors down to the middle of the nineteenth century, and another group of citations from leading theologians of the Church of England of a later date. There was an astonishing difference between the two groups. Let any reader compare Fr. D'Arcy's pages on this doctrine with Dr. Major's two sets of citations: I think there can be no doubt, though there may be some surprise, as to which set his exposition belongs. Nevertheless his most interesting, stimulating and significant book carries the *Imprimatur* of his Vicar-General at Westminster. It is dedicated to a brother member of the Society of Jesus whom some of our readers will remember from pleasant personal contacts and as an eager defender of his faith, the late Fr. Francis Woodlock.

[7] p. 90: *A Resurrection of Relics*, by H. D. A. Major; Blackwell, Oxford, 1922. p. 59: *The Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body*, by H. M. Burge, Bishop of Oxford; Mowbray, 1922.

THE CHURCHES: THEIR FUNCTION AND FUTURE

By the Rev. T. Wigley, M.A., author of *A New Highway towards Christian Reality, The Necessity of Christian Modernism,* etc.

PROFESSOR C. E. Raven, writing about the danger of the Church becoming a fossil possessed of a past but bereft of a future, declares:

> 'By its insistence that its dogmas are irreformable and its constitution sacrosanct, the Church invites such a fate; and if most denominations assert that they make no claim to infallibility and are eager for reasonable reforms, the assertion is hardly consistent with their practice. The records of the Lambeth Appeal, the Malines Conversations, the Lausanne Conference, and the Reunion Movement in general do not give much encouragement. The Church seems concerned rather with its safety than with its mission, with its traditions than with truth, with its processes than with its results: and these are not signs of health or youth.'[1]

This is well said, and in these formative days, when even those who have not been attracted by the Churches are beginning to see some possibilities of spiritual contribution in them, we may rightly raise the question, What is the test by which Church, creed, sacrament and order can be judged? The answer was given a long time ago, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' In other words, the test is a strictly utilitarian one. This does not mean that it is concerned only with what we shall eat and wherewith shall we be clothed; it includes the imponderables by which men live. To us organizing our institutions, shaping our words to match our thoughts, seeking the way of 'The Holy' in symbol and rite, comes the searching question, Is what you do making for effective living? The question is not, How old are you? or, Who founded you? or, Who in days gone by thought you worth preserving? Answers to that kind of question are entirely irrelevant to the present situation. It is because any answer's value depends on the correctness of the question to which it is an answer that I urge the necessity of being clear in our minds concerning the question which is being asked of all opinions and institutions, political, social and religious. It is this, Why are you here? What is your function? What human needs do you claim to meet? Unless a Church can interfuse itself into the life of the modern world and share reciprocally in its thought and life, thus meeting the world's needs, it will be cast out and trodden under the feet of men.

Along this utilitarian line of approach many of the problems, which in a former day generated more heat than light, are con-

[1] *The Gospel and the Church,* p. 235.

veniently by-passed by the modern mind; they may be left to theologians with archaeological interests. We must recognize from the start that historic expressions and embodiments of religion, such as Churches, rites and creeds, are not religion itself. They are manifestations of the spirit which is religion: they are means, not ends. Sometimes these forms, adequate enough to meet the needs of the day which saw their birth, become positive hindrances to the life of the spirit of a later day. Adaptation remains a condition of survival in an ever-changing environment. While, however, we are certain that religion is spirit, there is no need to fall into the absurd mistake of imagining that religion is spirit only and needs no embodiment. It is as true in religion as in morals that no man can be either good or religious in isolation, for man is a person only in relationship to other persons, *viz.* in society. Hence religion can be practically effective only as it is embodied in the social group. It is, I suggest, impossible to think of religion without such social embodiment to keep it an effective and creative force in the life of the world.

All around us we see people suffering from religious malnutrition, because they have refused to feed themselves in a socially religious way. Once they were associated with a Church, then they gave it up for reasons which seemed good to themselves without delving too deeply into their sub-consciousness; they may have continued for a while with private prayer in times of personal stress, but it gradually petered out, since it lacked any reinforcement from a fellowship of the religious life. Can they be surprised that now they are beginning to wonder whether life has any meaning, and ask, 'What's the good of anything?' In H. G. Wells' words,

> 'Before we can decide how life should be organized we must have some theory of what life is for, what its purpose is, what man's nature is.'

More than any other social institution a Church should be concerned with giving an answer to these questions. A Christian Church consists of a fellowship of those whose minds are kindred in so far as they seek to discover spiritual reality along the way of Jesus Christ. This reality will show itself in many forms in a realm of nature as well as in a realm of ends, that is, in a whole which is indissoluble to which Jesus did not hesitate to give the name 'The Kingdom of God.' It cannot be too often recalled that the first followers of Jesus described his mission as 'The Way,' and the proof of the validity and value of that Way is given to those who, following it, have found that it opens doors to new truth and a more satisfying and abundant life. Obedience is not only the test of discipleship; it is an essential condition of the attainment of truth in the religious as in any other sphere. As an American writer has said,

> 'There is continuing urgent need to fill in the word "God" with ethical content to save it from becoming a holy blur. The greatest enemy of theism is fog — intellectual and spiritual fog.'

On this Way there is no standing still, no marking time; the faithful are committed to going on in fellowship with him who was declared to be the Way, and in company with those others who are making the same endeavour. This Way is difficult, for, in addition to our own conflicting desires, many 'babes in Christ' will persist in sitting down in the middle of the road quite content with their own rattles; they don't want to move on; there is need for patience and understanding, and on occasion firmness and good sense, since to give in to the childish is to be unfaithful to the childlike. The more child-like in heart we become, the more eager we shall be to experiment as we awaken every morning into a new world with all its opportunities of discovery and dedication. To be a disciple means in essence to be a learner, and it is one of the tragedies of Churches that this duty of learning has largely remained neglected, whether through complacency or through the grotesque assumption that all truth was already known.

We may assume then the need for Churches on natural social and religious grounds. Their organization will depend on their utility in the circumstances which prevail in any given place and at any given moment. There is nothing peculiarly sacred in any organization, and its value will be entirely dependent on whether it serves to express the life of the organism and to meet the needs of those among whom it is set in a religious way. The late Professor G. Dawes Hicks liked to think of Plato's ideal state as becoming gradually realized in the Christian Church, although on a broader and more extensive scale than Plato conceived to be possible. A spiritual corporation formed as it were the nucleus of the community, and thus the individual would be carried out of 'shells and stones and tangle' into 'the divine, the immortal, the eternal' to which he is akin; it was an awakening from dream-life into the life which is life indeed, from multiplicity and change into the ultimately real, worthy and true, which was timeless and creative. It is important to note that in Plato's view the man who thus realized his oneness with reality would, because of it, ennoble the society to which he belonged. The test is still in the widest sense of the word utilitarian, and by their fruits alone can men know the genuineness and the character of any alleged fellowship of mind with mind and spirit with spirit. In such an environment it is possible to escape from a narrow self-interest into a larger whole, and to trust our noblest loves in a way which is difficult in any other setting; we are very susceptible to our background in nature, life and mind. A Church will, however, become untrue to the

genius of Christianity if it aims at an eclectic community of choice souls, and thereby denies the comprehensiveness of its own first principles. Loyalty to the members of our own platoon should be the expression of a loyalty to the whole army of which the platoon is but a part, and there is constant need to be on our guard against so narrowing our loyalty that it becomes incapable of recognizing that Churches as well as individuals are members one of another. Proscription is a blind alley off the spiritual way, whether it is concerned with creeds, sacraments, or organization. We can be quite sure that we are most truly interpreting the mind of Christ when we say that the sole condition of Christian fellowship should be a sense of spiritual need, and the will to make an honest attempt to meet that need by seeking to understand the purpose of God for us and for the world in filial relationship. There is need to be quite explicit on this point in view of the tendencies which we shall later notice.

> 'You may exclude me from your Roman Church, your Episcopal Church, and your Calvinistic Church, on account of supposed defects in my creed or my sect, and I am content to be excluded,' declared Channing, 'but I will not be severed from the great body of Christ.'

Many people outside and inside the Churches are to-day echoing his words.

There are three great human needs which the Churches must meet, or perish; and membership of 'The Way' involves them all. They are, in this order, worship, thought, and work. It is in worship together that we discover and appreciate the real presence of God. We lose ourselves to find ourselves in a living, present God with whom we have to do. In worship, as in no other attitude, there is sympathy with others and self-dedication, an out-going because there has been first the inward and the upward look; there is gratitude, contrition, resolution and hope. There is no need to attempt to 'explain'; that would be as foolish as to attempt to explain love or beauty. We must be content to name or describe, leaving explanation to those who claim to comprehend the eternal nature of God and man. I am quite sure that worship which shares the mind of Christ is the first essential, if our thinking is to be true and our service effective. Fortunately for most of us, as Rufus Jones once said,

> 'We do not need to understand vital processes and energies of life before we utilize them and start living by them,'

though this does not mean that we must not understand so far as we are able. It is one thing to admit that we don't know everything; it is quite another to go on to say that, because we don't know everything, we don't know anything. It is a Christian duty to be intelligent even in our worship: the unthinking mind is not the worshipful mind. Increasingly I am coming to believe that, while we speak much of our problems, our main problem is that

of the inner life itself. We expect it to grow of itself without exercise, without nourishment, without any ardent and thoughtful contemplation. But our inner life, like our physical life, is conditioned, and it will develop and become more real only as we learn to worship God, who is Spirit, 'in spirit and in reality.' What Jesus was constantly impressing on men was the sense of their personal relation to God, a relationship conceived as the most intimate filial piety and affection. Admittedly, here we move in a realm of symbols, but there will, I think, be common agreement that in worship we seek correspondence with a Life greater and richer than our own, but one to whom we are akin. This is a very practical issue. How practical it is we can appreciate from this confession of Dr. William Brown, the distinguished medical psychologist:

> 'Auto-suggestion, where it succeeds, is, I believe, much more nearly akin to prayer than is generally recognized by those interested only in the treatment of functional nerve disease by suggestion. I mean that it is rarely successful unless the patient has at least a sub-conscious belief that "the Universe is friendly." . . . For myself I find it is practically impossible to carry out auto-suggestion with conviction without it being really a form of prayer, since some kind of belief in the spiritual nature of the Universe seems to be implied in the belief that power is there to make the result suggested come true.'[2]

In the cultivation of this sensitiveness to spiritual reality, no less than to spiritual values, worship in all its forms is an indispensable aid to self- and other-realization.

While a reverent agnosticism has a rightful place in every Christian mind, we are not because of that absolved from using our brains in the understanding and practice of our religion. God takes no pleasure in ignorance, and we shall not be good Christians if we refuse to stretch our minds to the limit of their capacity. Both the world and the Churches have suffered much from those whose sincerity was undoubted, but whose zeal was not according to knowledge. And whatever tragic mistakes may have been made, no honest student of history can deny that from the first century to to-day the Churches have attempted to solve the problem of presenting their convictions in the thought-forms of their age, whether of the Apostolic, the Alexandrian, the Roman, the Schoolmen, or the Protestant. Where in most cases the Churches have erred is in forgetting Tertullian's famous words:

> 'Christ called himself the Truth: He did not call Himself Tradition. If He and his message are Truth, every increase of knowledge can be used to enrich the faith that rests on Him.'

To-day the most ordinary man is aware that revolutionary changes have taken place in all departments of thought from physics to politics. Either then we must adapt our religious expressions to

[2] *Religion and Life*, pp. 51 *f.*

our changed mental world-view, or our religion will cease to have any intelligible meaning for the modern mind and any relevance to the modern world. The issue is a serious one, and no glib but thoughtless repetition of ancient concepts and phrases will save that which has lost its savour. As we contemplate the situation in the majority of Protestant Churches so far as thinking is concerned, we can sympathize with H. E. Fosdick's dream of how many theological problems would have been avoided if the Protestant Reformation had come after Galileo, Newton and Darwin had finished their work. The evil effects of forms of thought in the intellectual life of the sixteenth century are with us yet. Fosdick reminds us of John Robinson's farewell sermon preached at Leyden before the Pilgrim Fathers left for Southampton to sail on the *Mayflower*:

> 'He took occasion,' said a member of the congregation, 'also miserably to bewail the state and condition of the Reformed Churches, who were come to a period in religion and would go no further than the Instruments of their Reformation. As, for example, the Lutherans: they could not be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw, for whatever part of God's will He had further imparted and revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it. "And so also," saith he, "you see the Calvinists. They stick where he left them, a misery much to be lamented."'

Happily, there are signs of a stirring of the dry bones; not only are there modernist movements in the Anglican and in the Free Churches, but the *Times Literary Supplement* (9.8.41), in a leader on 'The Church and Change,' asks:

> 'Has the Church shown the same resilience in adapting herself to mental climates as to physical climates?'

We may perhaps find some encouragement in the words with which the leader ends:

> 'In the history of the Church it has not infrequently happened that what is first denounced as impious heresy, is later allowed as a pious opinion, and finally proclaimed as revealed truth.'

In May 1941, at a General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the Moderator made the daring suggestion that the Longer and Shorter Catechisms of the Church could no longer be fitted into the spirit and tradition of our day and ought to be revised, that the place once nobly occupied by them to-day is empty, and that what was wanted was a brief statement in modern terms of the essentials of the Christian faith. It will not be, it must not be, he said, after the pattern either of Nicaea or Westminster; enough if it proclaim to all the world what it means to be a Christian. A similar demand for a brief statement has repeatedly been made in the columns of *The Times*, and so far it has not officially been met; but while officialdom gathers its thoughts together, the duty is laid upon each individual in social relationship to consider the matter for himself and, whatever his conclusions may be, to remember that a

fixed creed means a closed mind. Does not A. N. Whitehead say,

> 'We must be systematic; but we should keep our systems open. In other words, we should be sensitive to their limitations. There is always a vague "beyond," waiting for penetration in respect to its detail.'[3]

To worship with its sense of the reality of an environing spiritual world, to thought with its attempt to work out the implications of such a reality, must be added the task of ourselves participating in the making of our vision and our thought actual in the world of men. Our assumptions will be seen to be what they are only as we apply them in practice as rigorously as the man of science, for in religion as in the sciences any division between theory and practice is pernicious to each. John Macmurray is right when he urges that the past division between Caesar and God, our duty as citizens and our duty as Christians, has led in Fascism to this world being delivered over to the powers of darkness and destruction. We must cease conceding 'the root principles of rationality—equality, freedom, and universal community' as truths, and refusing their application in 'the practical field of material life.' This vicious dualism, he writes,

> 'has succeeded in making the world of the spirit — the world of freedom, equality and humanity, of ideals and religion and culture — another world; and *this* world has become in consequence a world of dark unconscious forces of destruction. It has insisted that the realization of humanity shall be postponed to another life, and so has made inhumanity the automatic law of this life. It has decided that the Kingdom of God shall be a kingdom in heaven, and delivered this world over to the powers of darkness.'[4]

I think I can detect in many recent socio-political writings signs that the more thoughtful outside the Churches are beginning to appreciate the fact that our political problems are more than problems of technical adjustment, that they have deep religious, moral, and philosophical roots which involve such fundamental questions as the purpose of life, the nature of virtue, the value of personality. The evidence is cumulative. In Mr. Victor Gollancz's book, *Shall our Children Live or Die?* we find this appeal:

> 'For my own part I look forward to the linking up, for this end, of a Church no longer divorced from politics, with humanists or stoics who accept the Christian ethic but not the Christian dogma. What hinders such co-operation? The sanction for conduct is different: the conduct valued is the same.'

Dr. Macpherson Lawrie, physician in psychological medicine, writes in his *Practical Possibilities*:

> 'Modern man requires a more stimulating, constructive, living and hopeful faith than the Church provides. . . . I believe the faith democratic man awaits is there, and his spiritual fervor could be stirred, and stirred by the Church, if the Church would take its cue from Medicine, and sub-

[3] *Modes of Thought*, p. 8. [4] *The Clue to History.*

stitute asepsis for antisepsis, or, in other words — Prevention for Redemption.'

A. N. Whitehead in his *Adventures of Ideas* hazards the prophecy

'that religion will conquer which can render clear to popular understanding some eternal greatness incarnate in the passage of temporal fact,'

and after a rapid survey of the rise and fall of civilizations he notes, among four factors which decisively govern the fate of social groups,

'the inexorable law that apart from some transcendent aim the civilized life either wallows in pleasure or relapses slowly into a barren repetition with waning intensities of feeling,' and 'the growth of reverence for that power of virtue of which nature harbours ideal ends, and produces individual beings capable of conscious discrimination of such ends. This reverence is the foundation of the respect for man as man.'

Mr. Sidney Dark in his book, *The Church, Impotent or Triumphant?* may be regarded as a hyphen linking the world and the Churches. He fears for the Church complacent and for the world materialistic.

'It is because I am convinced that there is real danger that, without the influence of the Church, the new order may be as spiritually destructive as the old . . . that I am equally convinced that in its two thousand years of history never was the need of the Church so great, its opportunity more splendid, its responsibilities so heavy, and never will its failure have been so tragic.'

We cannot afford to ignore these voices so long as the Churches' function remains to worship purely, to think clearly, and to act sincerely. In meeting the world's obvious needs I am convinced that the Churches which are truly Christian will win for themselves an abiding place in the world of to-morrow. It is for each to strive more seriously than ever to translate the life of devotion into contemporary forms and present situations. The Churches will have to take the trouble to keep in touch with all the movements of thought so swiftly flowing in these days. They must be prepared to use the best that the sciences, art, literature and philosophy can provide.

What this amounts to is a plea for a new realization of the truth and beauty of wholeness. Both the Churches and the world have suffered too long from isolationism; the partial and the fragmentary have been unduly stressed; false antitheses have divided religion from life, and the Churches from men. We must no longer separate our religious, scientific and social interests and values; the part should always lead up to a whole beyond itself; it is only so that its value is increased and balance attained. The Churches have need to learn that salvation, like health, is but another name for harmony of many parts; as Dr. Raven puts it:

'If God is God, universalism and integration must be characteristic of any real religion.'

THE APOSTLE OF ALGERIA

RAYMOND LULL, 1236—1315

By the EDITOR.

AT Palma in Majorca, in the year 1236, Raymond Lull was born. Lull's world was smaller than ours. Geographically it consisted of Europe, Northern Africa and Western Asia. The Mediterranean was its central sea. In Lull's world there were but three religions, those of Christ, Mohammed and Moses. Its literature was written in four languages, Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Arabic. The learned in Western Europe only knew Latin. But although a small world, its intellectual, religious and aesthetic energy was great.

During the eighty years of Lull's life many significant things happened. The national literatures of Southern Europe were born; the school of Italian painting originated; Gothic architecture began to assume its most inspiring forms; the newly-founded Universities became the chief training centres for service in Church and State; Parliamentary Government took its rise; the Church formulated a New Theology, the result of the recently discovered Aristotelian philosophy; Latin hymns unsurpassable in majesty and melody were composed in honour of the Virgin-Mother; the miracle of Transubstantiation and the terrors of the Day of Judgment; last, but not least, modern science was born into a world of which the acutest intellects believed in alchemy, astrology and magic.

Lull's age was one of mingled light and darkness. While it beheld the rise of arts and sciences, while it listened entranced to mendicant friars preaching Christian idealism, it sympathized with the extirpation of the Albigenses, the bloodshed of the Crusades, the cruelties of the Inquisition, the violent asceticism of the Flagellants, the aridities of Scholasticism, the search for the Philosopher's Stone and the *Elixir Vitae*. It might be justly described in the words of the Hebrew prophet, 'The light shall not be clear, nor dark; not day nor night.' Lull was born in the dayspring of the Renaissance, an age 'seething with great thoughts soon to be embodied in great lives.'

Among Lull's contemporaries were St. Thomas Aquinas and his rival Duns Scotus—the framers of contending theologies; Dante, the founder of Italian literature; Louis IX, the warrior-saint of France; Roger Bacon, the father of modern science;

Marco Polo, the Venetian traveller, who unveiled for Europe the wonders of Eastern and Central Asia; Cimabué and his pupil Giotto, the originators of modern painting. St. Francis of Assisi died ten years before Lull was born; St. Dominic fifteen years; Innocent III, who raised the Papacy to the highest point of temporal power, twenty years.

Lull was a Spaniard — a Goth, not an Iberian — by descent. His father, a knight of Catalonia, helped his sovereign, James I of Arragon, to conquer the Balearic Islands, and received for his services large estates in Majorca. His son Raymond succeeded to the estates and became Master of the Royal Household. He was a man of many accomplishments—a soldier, courtier, musician, poet. His extant poems are among the earliest examples of Catalonian literature. He was devoted to pleasure. Although married young, he seems to have ignored the claims of conjugal fidelity. One night, when composing a love poem to a lady of the court, he had a vision of Christ on the cross. On successive nights he resumed the composition of the poem, but the vision re-appeared. In Lull's case the vision was as effective as that which St. Paul beheld on the road to Damascus, or that which befell Joan of Arc among the apple blossom of Domremy. Lull resolved to renounce self-indulgence and devote himself to Christ. With Lull devotion meant active service. Thirteenth-century Christianity was certainly ascetic, but it was not the arid asceticism of the Thebaid. It was active and social. It not only suffered, it worked for Christ. Lull quickly decided on his life's work. He would be the Apostle of the Moslems. Why exactly he chose this task is not easy to say. Perhaps because he lived on the frontiers of Islam; perhaps because he came early under the influence of the Franciscans. St. Francis had done a remarkable thing. During the Fifth Crusade, when in 1219 the Christians were besieging Damietta, he visited the Christian camp, but he resolved to minister to their enemies also. He allowed himself to be led a captive before Malek-al-Kamel, Sultan of Egypt. The Sultan listened with respect to his exhortations, and when dismissing him said (so Bishop Jacques de St. Vitry relates):

> 'Pray for me that God may enlighten me, and enable me to hold firmly to that religion which is most pleasing to Him.'

In an age when the Church slaughtered heretics, offered to Jews and Moors the alternatives of baptism or exile, taught that Crusaders who fell fighting against Saracens passed straight to Paradise, Lull perceived that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God, and resolved to convert Mohammedans to Christianity by Christian means. He writes:

'It is my belief, O Christ, that the conquest of the Holy Land should be accomplished in no other way than as Thou and Thy apostles undertook to accomplish it — by love, by prayer, by tears, and by the offering up of their own lives.'

This is an extraordinary declaration for the son of a Spanish cavalier, whose father, sword in hand, had won his estate from the infidel.

The task to which Lull devoted himself was extremely difficult. To-day it is no easy matter to convert a Mohammedan, yet the Christian world commands the resources of philosophy, science and criticism in a much higher degree than does Islam. In Lull's day the position was reversed. Muslim culture stood much higher than Christian. By means of Arabic translations the Muslim world had become the heir of Greek philosophy and Greek science. Western Christianity was exerting no intellectual influence on Islam, but Islam was penetrating Western Christianity at many points. The philosophy of the Arab Averroes with its disintegrating scepticism, which taught that a thing might be true for faith but false for philosophy and *vice versa*, was gaining ground in the Christian universities; in medicine and mathematics as well as in alchemy and astrology Christian investigators looked to Islam for enlightenment; even in literature, as an Oxford professor of poetry has pointed out, the imaginative poetry of Southern Europe, whether of Sicily, Provence or Italy, was inspired by Arabian models.[1] To-day Christian converts to Islam are indeed rare. In Lull's day the seaports of Islam swarmed with Christian renegades. Mohammed was still in a very real sense the Anti-Christ, and the decision as to whether Europe should be Christian or Mohammedan was still in the balance. In the case of Africa and Asia it seemed to have been definitely settled; they were dominantly Mohammedan. The Christian feared the Mohammedan and he hated him. Dante placed Mohammed in the deepest portion of his Inferno. The reverses of the crusades and the ravages of Moorish pirates embittered Christian feeling. Moreover the Christian Church was profoundly ignorant of the tenets of Mohammedanism. Instead of viewing Mohammedans as ethical Monotheists, they regarded them as heathen. Alanus de Insulis, in the twelfth century, wrote a Latin book against Mohammedans and entitled it *Contra paganos seu Mahometanos*.[2] Lull's task was incredibly hard, and required that he should convert the Christian world to his ideals before he could convert the world of Islam to Christ.

[1] Mackail, *Lectures on Poetry*, p. 97.

[2] On the other side it ought to be noted that his contemporary, Peter the Venerable, a worthy precursor of Lull, translated the Koran into Latin, and wished that part of the New Testament might be translated into Arabic.

There is a prophetic saying, 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' Lull matured his plans slowly. Although thirty-two years old at his conversion, he spent some ten years in personal preparation. It took three forms—devotional, linguistic, and philosophical. He spent much time in prayer. He bought a Saracen slave and began to learn Arabic from him. The slave nearly assassinated his master and afterwards hanged himself. Lull studied scholastic philosophy at the University of Montpellier, and began to think out a system of Christian apologetic. As he proceeded with his personal preparation it became increasingly clear to him that he must work on a larger scale. He must rouse the interest of the authorities in Church and State to assist in the conversion of Islam by those means which he and he alone knew to be effective. He interviewed his sovereign, who gave him a handsome endowment with which he founded a missionary *studium* at Miramar. He secured thirteen Franciscan friars for it, but they grew weary and deserted. With indefatigable pertinacity Lull visited popes, sovereigns and university authorities, and strove to get Chairs of Arabic established in the universities. The authorities did not respond quickly. There were many more interesting and absorbing occupations. But Lull never gave in. Towards the end of his life he wrote:

> 'I have laboured for forty-five years to gain over the shepherds of the Church and the princes of Europe to the common good of Christendom.'

At last, in 1311, at the Council of Vienne, Lull, being now in his 75th year, secured a decree that Chairs of Arabic, Chaldee, Hebrew and Greek should be established in all cities where the Papal Court resides and in the Universities of Bologna, Paris, Oxford and Salamanca.

But a new Christian apologetic was not less needful than linguistic knowledge. In seeking this Lull invented an ingenious system of study—a sort of cyclopaedia of categories and syllogisms. On this account he became so famous in the universities that he received the title *Doctor Illuminatus*, and hundreds of students adopted his method—Lull's Art as it was called. A modern scholar (Prantl), after carefully investigating it, remarks:

> 'That the whole Art of Lull is plainly worthless needs now no special proof.'

Lull's Art was the outcome of Lull's conviction that the Christian missionary must receive a first-class mental training in order to win the intellectual assent of those whom he would convert. Just as Lull did not believe in force as a means of making converts, so he did not believe in missionary preaching which was not based on Reason. He wrote this:

'If the Christian faith is incapable of proof according to the processes of the mind, then it is impossible that it can be true';

and on another occasion he wrote:

'The attempt mentally to accept mutually incompatible things is the first step to the complete denial of the spiritual.'

In one of his exhortations to Christians he says:

'Let Christians consumed with a burning love for the cause of the faith but consider that since nothing has power to withstand the truth, which by the strength of arguments is mighty over all things, they can with God's help and by His might bring back infidels to the way of faith. . . . For to the infidels it seems a difficult and dangerous thing to abandon their own belief, . . . but it will be impossible for them not to abandon the faith which is proved false and contradictory for the sake of that which is true and necessary.'

Propagandist Christianity in Lull's day, when it did not make use of force, turned too often to miracles or ecstasies or vile abuse to win adherents. But to satisfy Lull's idea of conversion the Mohammedan must be shewn *rationally* why Christianity is true and Mohammedanism, by comparison, false. Lull had faith in the force of Reason and dared to believe that man is ultimately reasonable, and that therefore a religion which could justify itself at the bar of Reason must prevail. He really believed in the Divine Logos in humanity and was also sure that Mohammedans shared in the Logos. Hence he declared that he should find three good friends among the Mohammedans, namely, Subtlety of Intellect, Reason, and Good-will. Lull therefore is of that noble company, in which the Cambridge Platonists and Bishop Butler are also to be found, who believe that Reason is the candle of the Lord within us and that by which we must judge even of Revelation itself.

But although Lull believed in the human Reason, he did not suppose that by the exercise of the intellect alone man can know God. There must also be moral effort and whole-hearted devotion. This he sets forth clearly in one of his meditations:

'He who would find Thee, O God, let him go forth to seek Thee in love, loyalty, devotion, faith, hope, justice, mercy, and truth, for in every place where these are, Thou art.'

For Lull there could be no right opposition between Reason and Faith; nor any true alliance between Religion and Obscurantism.

'Elevate thy knowledge, and thy love will be elevated'

is one of his sayings.

But although self-discipline was essential in the man who would know God, it is important to note that Lull attached no primary importance to asceticism, although the ascetic rigours of that period were terrific. In the spirit of Him who said 'the Sabbath

was made for man, not man for the Sabbath,' Lull declared :

> 'Better is a life spent in instructing others, than a life spent in fasting.'

Even devotional exercises he thought might be over-valued in comparison with moral character and conduct. On one occasion he wrote :

> 'He who is just, compassionate, humble, patient, prays although he is not consciously thinking of God.'

Yet Lull was pre-eminently a man of prayer. Whilst he believed that to work is to pray, he also believed that to pray is to work, and spent long hours in devotion before the crucifix.

Lull believed that a new Christian apologetic was needful to win Islam to Christ. He worked long in constructing this apologetic. When we study it to-day we are compelled to say of large parts of it what Luther said of one of St. Paul's arguments, 'Brother Paul, this does not hold.' But the fundamental thesis of Lull's apologetic is sound and deserves the attention and respect of every Christian apologist.

Lull's age was an age of miracles. It invented the miracle of the Immaculate Conception; it witnessed daily with unquestioning reverence the perpetually recurring miracle of the Mass; it was wrought to adoring ecstasy by the marvels produced by the relics of the saints. What more natural than that Lull should base the Christian Faith on miracles? Paley in an age of rationalism, not to say of scepticism, based the Christian Faith on miracles. How could Lull escape doing so in an age of miracles? Yet he did. He based the Christian Faith, not on miracles, but where it must ever be found. He based it on the Character of God—the character of God as unveiled in Jesus Christ. This was the centre of his apologetic : we need not trouble about its circumference.

> 'That religion is the true religion,' said he, 'which holds the highest and most perfect conception of God.'

Now this was how he applied his argument :

> 'When we examine the Allah of Mohammed, although there be Righteousness and Wisdom visible in Him, there is no Love to be found; but when we examine the Christian Religion we see clearly that in it God is unveiled as Love. Now the conception of God as Love is the highest and most perfect conception we can have of God, and therefore the Religion of Christ is to be accepted in preference to the Religion of Mohammed.'

So spiritual, moral and rational a conception of the Christian Religion did not capture the Christian world. It failed to win even the enthusiastic adhesion of the rulers of the Church. Why? Perhaps a saying of our Lord answers the question :

> 'Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.'

Lull narrowly escaped ecclesiastical censure. He might have died as a heretic if many leading Churchmen had not regarded him as quite harmless — a well-meaning man, a religious man, but with a bee in his bonnet. After his death the Inquisitor-General in Arragon, at the instigation of the Dominicans, the zealots of orthodoxy, formulated five hundred charges against Lull's teaching, of which the three most important were these:

1. That one can prove by natural reason all the articles of the Christian faith.

2. That Jews and Saracens who believe in all good faith and do not sin mortally, can be saved.

3. That true love consists in loving God because He is God, and that it is false love which moves us to love God through hope of Paradise or temporal welfare.

His friends the Franciscans and his fellow-countrymen the Majorcans defended Lull, and so the prosecution failed.

A man with such large views of God's love and with such a profound belief in human goodness might easily have excused himself from facing the rigours and dangers of the life of the missionary in foreign lands. It is urged by some, but not justly, that liberal Christians do not become ardent missionaries. Such a charge was not true of Lull. Lull not only formulated an apologetic which was to win Islam; he not only founded centres for training missionaries to Islam; he himself became an active missionary to Islam.

He visited North Africa at least thrice. His first visit was in 1287. On landing he sought out the leading Mohammedan teachers. He told them that he possessed an accurate knowledge of Christianity, but that he wished also to have an accurate knowledge of Mohammedanism for the purpose of instituting a comparison between the two, and that he was resolved to adopt the truer as his religion. The Mohammedan doctors welcomed him, but failed to convert him, and he seems equally to have failed to convert them.

He next tried to convert the Mohammedans in Majorca, his native isle. Here he was most successful. In 1301 he visited Cyprus and desired the king to command his infidel subjects to attend a sermon (*predicatio*) to be delivered by Lull, which in true mediaeval fashion was to be followed by a disputation (*disputatio*).

He then tried North Africa again. In 1306 he had a most successful visit, and his arguments proved so effective that he was deported and warned not to come again. Nevertheless in 1314 he returned to Bugia (modern Bougie) and worked there in secret for over a year, but venturing to preach in public on June 30, 1315, he was stoned to death by a fanatical Mohammedan mob.

Although Lull was much too wise and too conscientious a man to throw away his life, and declined to go forth as a missionary until he had completed his Art, saying,

> 'O Lord, my help, till this work is completed I cannot go to the land of the Saracens,'

yet he was quite willing to die when his end came. Shortly before his death he had composed this prayer:

> 'Thy servant is ready to offer up himself and to pour out his blood for Thee. May it please Thee therefore, ere he comes to die, so to unite him to Thyself that he, by meditation and love, may never be separated from Thee.'

This is but the merest outline of Lull's life and work. Nothing has been said of his extraordinary literary activity. There have been 4,000 treatises assigned to him. This is gross exaggeration; but he did write several hundreds dealing not only with religion, but with physical science, mathematics, horsemanship, navigation, medicine, proverbs and philosophy. In connection with medicine he deals with two interesting facts: (1) the effect of climate on disease, and (2) the part that can be played by the mind in curing the sicknesses of the body. Lull himself had a striking experience of this.

Lull's theological treatises are of the most varied kind, ranging from *The Language of the Angels* to the *One Hundred Names of God*. One of Lull's most readable books is a religious allegory called *Blanquerna*. It has even been compared with *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Its hero is a monk, and its theme is the obligation of Christians to convert Moors and Jews. Lull in a spirit of irony put himself into his allegory under the character of the Papal Fool.

Raymond Lull deserves to be commemorated. He combined, as Neander points out, three qualities not often united in one personality—a very powerful intellect, a deeply loving heart, and great practical efficiency. The just balance of his Christianity, his clear grasp of essentials, his truly Christian spirit are remarkable. He was a thinker, a worker, a mystic. Two of his mystical sayings deserve to be treasured:

> 'The human spirit longs after nothing as it longs after God.'

> 'He who loves not lives not. He who lives by the Life cannot die.'

A CENTURY OF ANGLICAN SOCIAL THOUGHT

By the Rev. Ronald Preston, B.Sc. (Lond.), B.A. (Oxon.).

A CONSIDERATION of the social thought and influence of Christianity, and especially of the Church of England, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is apt to lead to a feeling of discouragement; it is difficult not to agree with the verdict of Dean Carpenter:

> 'The churchman of the period was good at the private virtues, but weak in public spirit, except in so far as that was aroused for his nation against other nations, for his social class against other social classes, for the prosperity of his church against non-conformity or unbelief. The comparative apathy of the average churchman in social matters at this time was an unhappy failure. . . .'[1]

The result is plain to see in our big industrial cities. It is the absence, except on a minute scale, of vital contact between the Church and ordinary working folk; the unreflective majority of them are indifferent and the better informed minority are hostile.

There are two main reasons for this failure. One is the decay and eventual loss, from the time of Laud, of the Christian tradition on social matters. Modern historical studies, particularly those of Professor Tawney,[2] have shown that the Reformation made no break in the unsuccessful attempts of Church leaders to apply traditional Christian social teaching; Laud was in the succession of Latimer as a conservative reformer trying to put the clock back. Neither of them would come to terms with the bourgeois revolution. But the alliance of the landed aristocracy with merchant capital which defeated Charles I, brought back Charles II, established William III and the Bank of England, and governed England until well after the Reform Bill of 1832, was too strong to pay attention to a Christian social tradition which had become increasingly fossilized and irrelevant. It quietly died out. Inadequate Christian social teaching was succeeded by none at all. Christian virtues were preached in a purely personal context. The desire for wealth changed, to quote Tawney,

> 'from a perilous, if natural, frailty into the idol of philosophers and the mainspring of society.'[2]

Consequently the Church had no weapons to deal with the strange phenomena of the Industrial Revolution, to tame the new social processes which had no sense of responsibility to the community,

[1] *Church and People.* S. C. Carpenter. p. 335.
[2] *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism.* R. H. Tawney.

and above all to capture the loyalty of the rapidly growing proletariat of the new industrial cities.

The second reason is that the Church of England was a class church; the church of the land and trade combination which governed the country; hence the bitter opposition of the Church of England clergy to the Reform Bill. The State connection and the tithe combined to reinforce the class association of the clergy with the rural gentry. This continued far into the nineteenth century and is not extinct to-day. As a result of these conditions the Church was always behind events rather than interpreting and partly controlling them. Indeed, it was not until the Oecumenical Conference at Oxford in 1937 that Church thought could be said to have caught up. We may pause to notice in passing that Nonconformity has not been in much better case. It became predominantly the Church of industrial capitalism and a backbone of the Liberal party. Nonconformists used their political influence largely to fight the Establishment, advocating the extension of the franchise to this end.

> 'Thereby they helped to open the doors to millions of voters who had quite other ends in view than the exclusion of dogmatic religion from schools, or the wholesale closing of public houses.'[3]

Both Church and Chapel are now left high and dry; no longer able to influence affairs through the governing classes, and remote from the lives of nine out of ten weekly wage-earners. It is our task to sketch how this has come about, with particular reference to the Church of England, remembering that almost everything to be recorded refers to the thought and activities of middle and upper class people, for they were the effective church folk.

Just over a century ago there were roughly the same three schools of thought in the Church that there are to-day. In 1830 the Evangelicals were a fashionable success but without the popular backing of Methodism. In John Wesley the seeds of reaction and reform had lain together, for he had no coherent social theory; Methodism rapidly took the reactionary alternative and Anglican Evangelicals did likewise. They were anti-democratic, individualistic, convinced that the world was under the control of the Evil One and lost. They called men to renounce it for another and future world, and the renunciation involved not only sin, but new ideas, beauty and learning as well. Resignation was the key virtue in this life. They had a horror of atheism which blinded them to any good in the popular movements of the non-church wage-earners from the French Revolution to Chartism, the same horror which prevented most Christians from a rational consideration of the U.S.S.R. in our own times. However, they were in fact more

[3] *The Transition to Democracy*. O. F. Christie. p. 126.

reforming than their conservative theory would lead one to expect. The efforts of William Wilberforce over the slave trade, and Hannah More with her schools in the Mendips, are well known; so are those of Lord Shaftesbury, the successor of Robert Raikes, in connection with ragged schools, chimney sweeps, public health and the struggle for the Ten Hours Bill, which lasted from 1831 to 1847. Justification by faith had to bear fruit in good works; wealth demanded responsible stewardship. But

> 'such noble achievements were rather raids into the realm of Satan to strike evil a splendid blow, but to be followed by a retreat behind the frontiers of the elect.'[4]

Westcott remarked on Shaftesbury's death that he wished he could have left theology alone. Clearly there was no Christian social teaching to come from these quarters, nor has there been from that day to this. Shorn of its fundamentalist setting, the same individualistic teaching can be heard in Evangelical circles to-day.

The early Tractarians were not in much better case, though their seed has borne greater fruit in their successors. Professor Raven has summed up their contribution with the words,

> 'when the cry of the oppressed was ringing in men's ears and when Christians might have listened to the prophets of social righteousness or to the victims of social evil, fifty years were wasted in lawsuits over regeneration and ritual, vestments and incense, and the precise meaning of sixteenth-century rubrics,'[5]

and it is difficult to deny the substantial justice of the charge. Their positive contribution was to stress the uniqueness of the Church, as a divine community able to speak with authority, in some sense over against the secular world. Unfortunately their dazzling vision of the Church never came beyond the church porch, and the realm of social and political affairs remained as alien and hostile to them as it was to the Evangelicals. Their community life was indrawn, with its eyes on the past, nourished by an almost magical view of the sacraments from which the social content was quite missing. With all their personal service and generosity they, no better than the Evangelicals, got beyond a class-conscious charity. Christian social theory did not develop here; nor indeed did it from the later ceremonialists who in the slums expressed a passionate sympathy for the under-dog without any very clear idea what to do about it.

More was to be expected from the Broad Church section. The term can only be used in a wide sense to cover a very varied company of people who were not necessarily conscious of being a defined group. They had no fear of reform as such or of new ideas

[4] *Liberal Evangelicalism*, by H. A. Wilson; quoted in G. C. Binyon, *The Christian Socialist Movement in England*, p. 57.

[5] *Christian Socialism*. C. E. Raven. p. 21.

as such. Arnold of Rugby saw further than many of his contemporaries into the social evils of his time, yet his remedy was vaguely thought of as an effort on the part of a renewed Church and a renewed aristocracy to mend matters, not altogether unlike Disraeli's 'Young England' group. With F. D. Maurice, however, we are on surer ground. Much of his life was dogged by struggles with those Evangelicals and Tractarians who held a crude verbal inspiration view of the Bible, and to that extent he seems a 'modernist' to us. But the cosmic sweep of his thought grasped the wholeness of God's purposes in creation and history in a way which has not always characterized liberal thought, whilst his positive social approach was a wholesome corrective of the other-worldliness of the Evangelicals and the nostalgia for the past of the Tractarians. Yet his insistence on God's order as already operative, marred only by man's failure, his non-historical outlook, and his hatred of man-made schemes to put things right, prevented him from working out a Christian social theory. His work, however, has proved an inspiration to others, who have seen that God's order, established in creation and restored in principle in Jesus Christ, must be realized as far as we can in practice, and that means varying schemes in different historical circumstances. Maurice's thought has mostly influenced one wing of the Catholic section of the Church of England, especially through Stewart Headlam and Conrad Noel. Later Liberals have not succeeded in getting much beyond the individualism of the Evangelicals without their literalist theology. They have been handicapped by a vague doctrine of the Church and an optimistic doctrine of man. The former has made it difficult for them to distinguish between the Church and the whole community which is regarded as Christian — in some ways more Christian than the Church. The optimistic view of man has meant that one of the distinctively Christian contributions to social thought, and the one specially needed by secular idealistic reformers, has been missed. It also meant that those liberals who were conscious of social evils tended to think that the removal of bad environmental influences and the providing of better education would lead to the flowering of Christian virtues. The Christ in ordinary folk, now thwarted by bad conditions, would then shine clearly. This was true even of Barnett, whose work in Whitechapel from 1873 was the most constructive of all Christian social efforts in the nineteenth century. This of course is the common attitude of secular social reformers of to-day. An even more prominent tendency of middle-class liberals has been an optimistic and conservative acceptance of things as they are, borrowed from the period of expanding free capitalism when liberal theology came into its own.

Meanwhile, throughout this period working-class theology, so far as it had any, was a reverence for the ethical teaching of Jesus, with the apocalyptic and eschatological elements excluded, combined with a conviction that the social system was in flat contradiction to it, and that the Church had not the courage to say so. One expression of this was the 'Labour Churches,' thirty of which were in existence in 1907, though none have survived. It is still the point of view of most reflective workers: the theology of the Church remains irrelevant and unintelligible to them.

It is time to turn to a brief sketch of events. The Christian Socialism of Maurice, Ludlow, Kingsley, Hughes and Neale did not begin until 1848, after all the ferment of the preceding years of the century, culminating in the Chartist fiasco of 1848, had died away. The Church was years behind the times. The title, said Maurice,

> 'will commit us at once to the conflict we must engage in sooner or later with the unsocial Christians and the un-Christian Socialists.'

Its Working Men's Associations were examples of producers' co-operation, a fondness for which has characterized much Christian social theory ever since. It was well that the experiment was tried, but experience shows that it is not the best way of dealing with the problem of power in modern industrial society; workers are themselves a sectional interest. We are all consumers, however, and Consumers' Co-operation, on the Rochdale model, has forged ahead in retail trading and also in many lines of production through the English and Scottish Co-operative Wholesale Societies. Consumers can best control heavy and basic industry through one of the many methods of public control or ownership. Unwillingness to accept this has led much Christian thought to a dislike of machine production and to toying with the impossible idea of harking back to a more primitive pre-industrial state of society. Unfortunately the Christian Socialists themselves, especially Ludlow, were blind to the merits of consumers' co-operation; although Neale and others played a part in it, their faith in producers' co-operation is shown by the fact that as late as 1872 they backed the London Council of Builders. After 1854, when all the associations had failed, the energies of the Christian Socialists were turned into other channels: Kingsley, the mouthpiece, into literary and parish work; Ludlow, the only one of them who knew much about socialism, into the Friendly Societies; Neale to the Co-operative Movement; and Maurice to education at the Working Men's College, where there was, in the words of Frederic Harrison,

> 'some Christianity, a little armchair socialism, and a mild infusion of real working men.'

Nevertheless it is very largely due to them that the divorce between Christianity and working-class politics, though wide enough, is nothing like so complete as it is on the Continent.

For the moment, however, the Church was little affected. The years after the turn of the century were prosperous; labour agitation died down. The rich and powerful were urged to be benevolent and the poor to practise self-help. Discussion on social affairs in church bodies, such as the revived Convocations and the new Church Congresses, was confined to Temperance and Education. The former was sceptically received by many and provoked Archbishop Magee's *bon mot*,

> 'If I must make my choice, I should say it would be better that England should be free than that England should be sober,'

whilst Church leaders never, in their attitude to the latter, got free from the odour of charity and condescension which had clung to their educational policies from the days of Hannah More and the foundation of the National Society in 1811. In the agricultural unrest of 1872-74 associated with Joseph Arch, the Established clergy were, with a few exceptions such as Bishop Fraser of Manchester, Dean Stubbs of Ely and E. D. Girdlestone, so reactionary that Bishop Gore once said it was the only time in his life when he was tempted to leave the Church. Girdlestone should be remembered for organizing the emigration of two-thirds of his parish of Halberton, North Devon, between 1866 and 1872, when the local farmers refused to raise wages; as a result wages rose from 7/- or 8/- to 17/- per week.

Events moved more swiftly after 1870. Great Britain had no longer a virtual industrial monopoly. Carlyle and Ruskin had made their protest against *laissez-faire* industrialism. The old classical economics was being humanized by Marshall, the Webbs were beginning their social studies, whilst the work of Toynbee, Cunningham and Ashley was bringing a historical perspective to bear on what was coming to be known, in Toynbee's phrase, as 'The Industrial Revolution.' Settlements were begun in the East End with Toynbee Hall in 1884; Charles Booth was driven by his Salvation Army experiences into a study of social conditions; Henry George's 'Progress and Poverty' startled the orthodox economists in much the same way as Schweitzer's view of Jesus startled liberal Protestants in 1906. Positivism was affecting middle-class secular reformers, and Marxism was heard of. Anglican social thought began to move. In 1877 Stewart Headlam founded the Guild of St. Matthew at Bethnal Green,

> 'to promote the study of social and political questions in the light of the Incarnation.'

It depended very much on the personality and character of its

founder. It was more socialist than Maurice, but did not get much further towards a plan relevant to the times than he did. Headlam was temperamentally apathetic to Fabianism (and it was the Fabian Society which gave the Labour movement a programme — public ownership), whilst his unhistorical view of the past led him to apply statements of the Fathers or the Anglican Reformers to situations which they were never designed to fit. Further, he was diverted by Henry George's Single Tax Movement. His best work, and in this Conrad Noel followed him, was to stress the social implications of Baptism and Holy Communion, as against the older Tractarians who were led away by the individualistic pietism of the Counter Reformation.

Fresh steps were taken in 1889, the year of the great dock strike, with the foundation of the Christian Social Union, 'to study in common how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time.' Westcott was the first President, followed by Gore. It is doubtful if the Church of England got further than Westcott until after C.O.P.E.C. in 1924. Westcott's position is indicated by this three-fold statement:

> 'If the Word became flesh, the brotherhood of man is a reality for us. If the Son of God was crucified, the fall, and with it the redemption, are realities for us. If the Son of Man rose again from the dead, the eternal significance of our short space of labour is a reality for us.'[6]

Westcott's thought was too abstract for many, who found Scott Holland more to their taste. By 1897 the Christian Social Union had 27 branches and 2,600 members, and its influence was widespread. Much work was done on the social teaching of the Bible, both of the prophets and of Jesus, whilst there was for the first time an emphasis on the study of the actual social situation. It began to be seen that the form in which Christian ends are realized will vary with different stages in the social process, and the facts of that process must be mastered before it is possible to know what to advocate. The Oxford branch issued the *Economic Review* from 1891 to 1914; and the first volume contained an acute appraisal by Scott Holland of Leo XIII's encyclical *Rerum Novarum*:

> 'There is a patriarchal simplicity assumed throughout — it has all nothing to do with the world in which we live; it is the voice of some old-world life, faint and ghostly, speaking in some antique tongue of things long ago.'

In 1908 our present Archbishop of Canterbury and Rashdall argued as to whether the Christian Gospel involves evolutionary socialism. The Christian Social Union studied social problems such as housing, published 'white lists' of firms not selling goods

[6] Quoted, *'The Church of England and Social Reform since 1854.'* D. O. Wagner.

produced by sweated labour, and took a great interest in the Trade Boards Act of 1909. It was very remote, however, from working-class life; even Scott Holland had little direct touch with labour, and to many who joined it Christian social teaching did not mean much more than being kindly within the structure of capitalism, or reforms which were sufficiently conservative to be thought non-political. Nor were they sufficiently influential to prevent the ethos of the Fabian Society, run by the Webbs, Shaw and Graham Wallas, from being a kind of ethical positivism.

However, the Christian Social Union had a considerable influence on the Church; between 1889 and 1913 fourteen of its members became Bishops. In 1907 a Report of the Convocation of Canterbury on *The Moral Witness of the Church on Economic Subjects* said,

> 'the idea of individual salvation has been disastrously isolated in Christian teaching and in current Christian belief from the social idea of original Christianity. . . .'

The Lambeth Conference of 1908 re-hashed stock Christian Social Union phrases. Yet the political vagueness of much Christian Social Union work, and the effeteness of the Guild of St. Matthew, led a group of Anglicans to found the Church Socialist League in 1906. Its members included Conrad Noel, Henry Slesser, R. H. Tawney, Maurice Reckitt, Paul Bull and W. H. Frere. From the start its basis was uncertain; there were theological disagreements which led to later splits, nor was it clear what type of socialism the League stood for. Labour itself was troubled with Syndicalism at this time. On the whole it favoured Guild Socialism, and thus came round almost full circle to the position of the Christian Socialists half a century before (Ludlow did not die till 1911), and which had persisted in spite of Fabian and Marxist criticism. Is it an attraction for the Middle Ages which has led so many Christians, some of whom are still with us, to think that their faith demands a commonwealth of producers' organizations? The ambiguity as to whether the members were Christians *and* Socialists, or Christians *hence* Socialists, led to Conrad Noel leaving the Church Socialist League and forming the Catholic Crusade in 1918, following Headlam's theology ('It's the Mass that matters' was a saying of his), and finding there the pattern of the Christian communist commonwealth. A remnant still continues as the Order of the Church Militant. In 1923 another split in the Church Socialist League occurred when the League of the Kingdom of God was formed. Its members were as anxious as those of the Catholic Crusade to have a Christian programme but were unwilling to take one over ready-made, as they expressed it, from the Labour Movement. Since 1925 they have sponsored a Summer School of

'Christian Sociology' at Oxford, now allied with Church Social Action of the Church Union, which strives to find some 'Christian' alternative distinct from the programmes of the different political parties. In 1924 the remainder of the Church Socialist League became an inter-denominational Society of Socialist Christians, now known as the Socialist Christian League, whose chairman is Father Groser of Stepney. The League is active within the working class Labour Movement and makes some distinction, though not a very clear one, between the Christian Faith and a socialist political and economic structure of society. Meanwhile the Christian Social Union had joined with the Navvy Mission in 1919 to form the Industrial Christian Fellowship, with plenty of funds but no policy. For a time the personality of Studdert Kennedy carried it along; lately it has grown steadily nearer in outlook to the Church Union school of 'sociology.'

As far as the Church of England as a whole is concerned, interest in Christian Social teaching has greatly increased, due in part to the influence of the Christian Social Union and the Industrial Christian Fellowship and in part to the economic dislocation of the times. Furthermore, it has become merged into inter-denominational and then Oecumenical activity. 1911 saw the first meeting of an inter-Church Conference of Social Service Unions, the experience of which led to the Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship at Birmingham in 1924. That Conference marked the end of an epoch. It owed a great deal to Anglican thought of the preceding fifty years, and especially to the Report of the Commission on Industrial Problems appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1917, and to the ideas of Westcott. C.O.P.E.C. in turn contributed to the stream of oecumenical thought at the Stockholm Conference on 'Life and Work' in 1925. This set up a research department, which together with the Christian Social Council of Great Britain, prepared for the Oxford Conference on 'Church, Community and State' in 1937 and preceded it by the most thorough oecumenical interchange of thought that had taken place for many centuries. Anglicans are no longer working out a Christian social theory on their own; they are enriched by the contributions of an American Protestant like Reinhold Niebuhr, a Continental Reformed Churchman like Emil Brunner (who has written the most comprehensive modern book on Christian Ethics[7]), a Greek Orthodox like Nicholas Berdyaev and a Roman Catholic like Jacques Maritain. Plainly we have moved far since C.O.P.E.C. Sex, drink, housing, education, cannot be isolated: the whole structure of society is involved. A far more accurate analysis of the evolution and present

[7] *The Divine Imperative.* Emil Brunner.

state of capitalism has been required; the challenge of modern totalitarianism has had to be met, and in particular the 'ideological' element in thought, which Marxism has pointed out, has had to be appreciated. Indeed Christian social thought, as that of the Labour movement as a whole, has only recently begun to face the challenge and to see the weakness of Marxism. More appreciation is still needed of fundamental economic problems. Loose phrases such as 'substituting co-operation for competition' and 'production for use and not for profit' conceal the real problems. But the crucial need of 'planning for freedom' has been made clear by sociologists such as Karl Mannheim.[8] Oecumenical thinking is grasping these issues, and now it can be claimed for the first time for centuries that the best Christian thought is not only abreast of events, but sees further than that of non-Christians.

Yet in the Church of England much remains to be done. For one thing the whole economic structure of the Church itself is called into question on all sides, and if the Church has not the vision to reform itself, the time may not be far distant when it is forcibly reformed from without. Again it has failed to raise up more than a handful of labour and trade union folk who are also Churchmen, and have related their religious and political views within a theology which could comprehend them both in terms of a final purpose, and indicate where the lessons of each had relevance to the other. Consequently the younger leaders of the Unions and the Labour Movement are increasingly atheistical, whilst many of the older ones cling pathetically to a secular humanistic optimism.[9] In this respect the prospect for the Church of England is none too hopeful. The great bulk of Anglican social thought in the last century has been contributed by Anglo-Catholics. They have tried to develop the social theories of the Middle Ages, which were largely lost because of their inadequacy.

> 'They were inadequate from the first to the facts of the case, and were bound to become more and more inadequate as the facts themselves changed during the ensuing ages.' [10]

There has been a grave danger of the mistake being repeated and of clericalism creeping in, and the formalism which Bishop Kirk of Oxford has pointed out as one of the three great dangers of moral theology.[11] As the Anglo-Catholics have adopted Roman devotions, so they have become more attached to Aquinas and the

[8] *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction.* K. Mannheim.

[9] Article, *'The Christian Socialist Movement in England.'* D. M. Paton. Radical Religion (New York), Fall, 1938.

[10] *Historical Illustrations of the Social Effects of Christianity.* C.O.P.E.C. Commission Report, Vol. XII, p. 169.

[11] *The Vision of God.* K. E. Kirk.

economic theories of Antonino of Padua, when they have not been led astray by Major Douglas. Their analysis of modern economics and industry has been inadequate and erroneous because their theology has prevented them from admitting the necessary autonomy of the social sciences and hence from acquiring the specialized technique needed for dealing with the complex modern social scene. Further, their search for some 'Christian' alternative to the authoritarian or democratic planning which are the only courses open to us, has meant that they have been remote from the practical issues of the day. The influence of specifically Anglican thought has therefore tended to be confined to a very theoretical sociology on the one hand or else to small Utopian left groups on the other. The Malvern Conference of 1941 was to a large extent the latest example of the former.

The question remains, granted that the Church is committed to making the Kingly rule of God mean something real in industrial and political life, does it follow that Anglican doctrine implies a distinct form of social organization and programme of action? Or rather, since in this matter Anglican doctrine is that of Christendom, does Christian doctrine as such lead to a specifically 'Christian' form of society? The attempt to maintain that it does is bound up with a particular view of natural law and of the relation of secular learning to Theology, the Queen of the Sciences, marred by an absence of the insight that we owe to Protestantism and ultimately of course to the Bible itself, that all social systems fall short of the absolute demands of the Gospel. Consequently the Christian task is always to work for the next step forward in the light of the possible alternatives open at the time. To understand these involves a good deal of general and specialized knowledge which is not peculiarly 'Christian' and on which opinions may very well differ; hence the conclusion which emerges from such a process of reflection cannot be labelled 'Christian.' There is bound to be an element of uncertainty. Allied with this is the necessity of impressing on lay folk the duty of working out singly and together their Christian responsibilities in their daily jobs, and, what is equally important, leaving them to do it.

All this is a wide subject which it is impossible to pursue further here. The point is that traditional moral theory, when dealing with these problems, built on unsound foundations. The Reformation never did its work in reforming Moral Theology; yet until this weakness of Moral Theology is frankly faced little progress is possible. The Church of England is strategically placed for working on it, and within that Church all parties must be prepared to play their part.

A SOLILOQUY ON CHURCH REFORM

By the Parson of a Hamlet.

To pool or not to pool: that is the question:
Whether 'tis wiser for the priests to flounder
'Mid troublous waves of old glebe-haunted hamlets,
Or jump into the calm wide Pool of income,
Sponsor'd by that great Nimrod of the North,
And float there in a drowsed equality?
To plunge into the Pool, and so to end
The back-aches and the thousand odd-man jobs
The parson's heir to, 'tis a consummation
Devoutly to be wished. To pool, to rest
In modest competence safe and secure,
In a small house with ample gadgets fraught,
To ease the toil of unservanted days;
'Tis peace. But in that peace what dreams may come
With clutching fingers pulling at the heart?
'These pokey rooms! We did have space to breathe
In those old days, and room to house a guest.'
To plunge; to lose the parson's freehold rights,
The 'corporation sole,' his freedom's guard;
That gives him pause; there is the bodkin sharp.
Yet on the other hand how few can bear
The burden of a giant rectory
With bleak, gaunt rooms and icy passages,
Meagre endowments, vast dilapidations,
Unending problems of scarce ways and means,
Unless the fear of losing freedom cast
A gloomy shadow 'cross the sunny Pool.
To be compell'd to starved retirement
While feeling strength within to do his job;
Ay, there's the rub: that puzzles all the will,
And makes us rather bear the ills we have
Than plunge into the tranquil unplumb'd Pool.
Action is lost: our hamlets will not weep;
They do not long to pool and lose their parson
Dwelling in their midst — not over-much beloved,
But yet their own and with no rival shar'd.
And thus the Church Assembly's resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought;
And vaunted schemes of dubious pith and merit
Lose the bright colours of their framers' dreams.
Into my madden'd brain steal hope and light:—
Let Q.A.B. in wise and quiet ways
Maintain our freedom and adjust our homes:
No bureaucratic system for the whole;
But to each hamlet as its need requires,
And local help supports judicious schemes.

A. B. Johnston.

BOOK REVIEWS

A NEW DIALECTIC*

In disturbed times such as the present it is natural to seek 'some plan or pattern in the welter of events.' Canon Geoffrey Allen is able to discern such a pattern, which is 'so simple and clear, once we see it, that its very simplicity may make it suspect.' It is to be found in the Hegelian triad of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, a formula which Marx employed in his interpretation of history. Canon Allen advances his formula with proper reservations, 'acknowledging that there are other happenings which do not fit into the simplicity of our scheme.'

The first stage of social organization is that of authority or law, which may be represented by a single, supreme and dictatorial figure, to whom the individual is subservient. Liberty is now at a discount. After this first stage comes what may be called the first disillusionment; the inadequacy of the authoritative form of organization is discovered, voices which before seemed infallible now reveal their fallibility, and the individual strives for a greater liberty. It is now authority in all its forms that is at a discount. And then this stage is followed by another reaction or disillusionment. The faults of a state of society where each individual is free to seek his own advantage become manifest; *laissez-faire* falls into discredit.

This may be interpreted as a mere swing of the pendulum, and there is always the danger that disillusionment with liberty may react violently into the arms of authority.

> 'It is obvious that this has happened very widely in recent years. We may see it in a repudiation of religious liberalism, and a return to various forms of religious dogmatism. . . . This swing from antithesis back to thesis explains many things at the present time. We can understand the strange revival, at the present hour, of patterns of behaviour which belong to the dawn of history, and which we thought had long ago been left behind.'

Yet the hour of despair may be the hour of promise and thus promote a new creative step rather than a barren and pointless reaction.

> 'Beyond thesis and antithesis there is synthesis. Beyond authority and liberty there is free fellowship. We live on the threshold of a creative period, out of which there will be born a new world. As many have found in these days, in a city where all lights are blacked out we see for the first time the stars.'

We cannot expect to see clearly the details of a world which is in process of formation:

> 'In any case it will not come through mechanical conformity to blueprint plans. It will come through a spiritual creation in our souls, and only then will it take expression also in outward material things.'

That the above formula is not a mere restatement of the maxim about the swing of the pendulum is clear; a perpetual oscillation to and fro can lead nowhere. On this view both thesis and antithesis are false, and the only choice open to mankind lies between alternative routes to perdition. But in Canon Geoffrey Allen's view, thesis and synthesis alike are seen as half-truths when the synthesis has been attained. Each taken in isolation is a falsehood,

* *Law with Liberty*, by Geoffrey Allen. (S.C.M. Press. 5/-. 1942.)

yet in the synthesis both sides are needed, though they will be transmuted into something new.

Canon Allen makes a wide application of his principle — to the family, to personal relationships, to economic and political organization, to international affairs, to theology, and to the Church, devoting a chapter to each. The reader will find each section full of illuminating ideas.

To illustrate the method. In the family, you get first the parent-child relationship, with its authoritative and protective love (*thesis*). Then comes the discovery of the fallibility of parents, which is 'the first disillusionment.' There follow the revolts of adolescence, and the quest for the liberty and maturity of a free character (*antithesis*). Then arrives 'the second disillusionment'—the discovery of the fallibility of the self. And finally a free fellowship between the older and younger generations, when the child, become mature, and its parent enter into a new relationship of free mutual respect (*synthesis*).

Or, in the case of Law and Grace. The *thesis* is the Old Covenant and the authority of the Law. The first disillusionment is expressed in the Pauline saying, 'The good that I would I do not, etc.' Then comes the *antithesis*, a revolt against the Law, desire in conflict with duty. Next, the second disillusionment—the shame over instinctive and self-assertive action. And finally the *synthesis*, the union of duty and desire, and the love which is a fulfilling of the Law.

The chapter entitled 'Pride and Fear,' in which the problems of individual psychology are dealt with, is in some respects the most interesting in the book. An important distinction is drawn between the submergence of the individual in the crowd, and the enrichment and expansion of the individual which genuine fellowship promotes. There is also a very clear and accurate analysis of the sources of pride and fear, and of their relationship to love.

No doubt this Hegelian formula needs to be applied with caution, for what is true in logic will not always fit what Kant called 'the fertile bathos of experience.' A fact which should not be overlooked, as Canon Streeter pointed out, is that 'the pendulum only swings because there is a relatively stable pivot upon which to oscillate.' If the pivot breaks loose, chaos follows. This may happen in politics, in individual psychology, in fact in every sphere. Even the engine of progress needs to be well rivetted onto its bedplate.

But what is so especially refreshing and invigorating about this book is that the author neither tries to return to the dead past nor looks to a future which is equally dead because predetermined. Thus he is not guilty of that *Trahison des clercs* which seems to have afflicted so many of our intellectuals who have lost their nerve and are in headlong retreat from Liberty. Perhaps the reason is that Canon Geoffrey Allen has been 'up against it,' and has played his part in a tough world. The following stirring passage about reunion would seem to suggest it:

> 'The urgency of the present hour is everywhere drawing the churches together in this first approach of friendship and co-operation. In Europe a common suffering under persecution has brought Catholic and Protestant together. In China after the fall of Canton we were faced with a burning city, a complete breakdown of all government and trade, and the necessity of organizing food and shelter at a few days' notice for over twenty thousand destitute people. The need compelled and produced a miracle of co-operation. Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Free Churches, Adventists and Pentecostal Missions, and the Salvation Army worked together in faultless team-work under a single committee. As we thus worked barriers of suspicion disappeared. The stark realities of the situation brought us back to the essentials of our faith, and we then discovered that the same Christ was, in fact, Lord in love over us all.'

This book is emphatically the right stuff.

J. C. HARDWICK.

THE IRON RATION OF A CHRISTIAN*

Pastor Vogel's little volume, *The Iron Ration of a Christian,* is highly significant. Vogel is or perhaps was a Lutheran pastor of a country parish near Berlin. He supported Professor Dehn of Halle, who in 1933 defended pacifism as a Christian possibility in time of war and for doing so was left by the university and church authorities to become a victim of popular clamour. Vogel was then appointed lecturer in the Berlin Theological College of the Confessional Church, which was suppressed when Hitler came to power. Vogel opposed the 'German Christians' who claimed to reconcile the Lutheran Confession and National Socialism and was one of the leaders in the formation of the Confessional Church, which has refused to allow itself to become a tool of the Nazi state and abides by the Confession of Augsburg.

Such conflict and persecution as beset the Christian in Germany to-day demand not argument but challenging proclamation and unhesitating assertion. Vogel no more believes in 'sweet reasonableness' than does the author of the *Apocalypse*. Where it is claimed that Adolf Hitler is the new Messiah and that to obey God's will is to be a National Socialist and to accept that party's racial theory, the spirit of Luther inevitably prevails over that of Erasmus, and Karl Barth's uncompromising paradoxes seem to offer an impregnable citadel. Where there is no argument there can be no criticism unless the proclamation is found to be an argument in a circle. Vogel proclaims:

> 'It is *God himself* who has mercy on us in Christ, for in Christ he became *truly a man'* (p. 135), and 'God forsaken by God, the Son forsaken by the Father, and still the Son forsaken by the Father on the Cross is eternally one with the Father, whose wrath he endured and appeased' (p. 154).

Such a statement, to say the least of it, seems to demand some explanation and definition. When faith in God is defined to be

> 'not the product of human longing nor a power residing in the human spirit but created only by the Holy Spirit' (p. 202), 'when it is said that God alone produces in us the faith to receive this news, that the same God who passes on us an eternal judgment pronounces an eternal acquittal in Christ who took our place' (p. 203),

it appears to follow that no one can be condemned if he has not that 'faith' or understanding.

The *crux* of Vogel's theology lies in its assumption of divine sovereignty. 'God *must* do nothing. He is free and sovereign. In particular, God must not necessarily have mercy on us' (p. 137). But all that is best in to-day's thought assumes that the true measure of power is responsibility. The only God it can accept is a God who can be accounted responsible for the use which he makes of his power. To the doctrine of the irresponsible power of the Führer the Barthian such as Vogel opposes that of the irresponsible power of God. That is why, deeply as English Christians sympathise with the Christians of the Confessional Church and admire their heroic resistance in the face of bitter persecution, they cannot share the theological basis of their bravery.

H. C. SNAPE.

SOCIETY: NATURAL AND DIVINE†

In preparing some lectures, Mr. Carleton, of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, 'went back to the Bible with the question, what are we taught here about the Church?' His first six chapters, giving the results of this inquiry, are an interesting exposition, akin to the work of Father Hebert, of the continuity of biblical revelation, showing 'how the New Testament doctrine

* *The Iron Ration of a Christian,* by Heinrich Vogel. (S.C.M. 6/-. 1942.)
† *Society: Natural and Divine,* by A. P. Carleton, B.D. (S.P.C.K. 1942. xv+152 pp. 6/-.)

of the Church is a flowering of the ancient doctrine of Israel which appeared as a bud in the Old.' To say that the Church is the new Israel is familiar enough, but Mr. Carleton's detail, especially in his discussion of the Messiah is well worth reading. Not that it is all easy to accept. Its strength is in spiritual perception and in the seriousness with which the idea of revelation is taken. Its weakness, most readers of this journal will think, lies in extreme critical conservatism, not perhaps in principle, but constantly in fact. The author 'is convinced that the Fourth Gospel is the work of St. John and that the discourses contain a substantially reliable account of our Lord's words.' The Matthaean account of Caesarea Philippi is used without reference to Mark; Mt. 18, 15ff is not questioned and Mt. 28, 18-20 is no 'less reliable than any other saying recorded in St. Matthew: except that we assume that Jesus Himself could not have used the Trinitarian formula, which no one who starts from the Catholic position will see any need to do.' It is no slur on his intellectual integrity to ask what precisely is the link between his critical and theological conservatism. For, despite his obvious charity of mind, he maintains unyieldingly the Catholic position in the controversial sense of the term. Attention may be drawn, however, to an interesting but obscure passage on visibility, pages 84-87.

The remaining chapters on the Church and Society say little of importance. Mr. Carleton's use of 'natural' is not clear, and his distinction of the true church from the empirical unconvincing (*e.g.* 'There is nothing wrong with the Church and it cannot fail,' p. 115).

This book is easy to find fault with, but liberals, modernists and the like should read it. It is a good specimen of a type of exegesis which is now deservedly influential, but needs a careful scrutiny. It is a reaction, and there will certainly be a reaction from it in time. Meanwhile let us learn all we can from it.

S. L. GREENSLADE.

WHITHER CIVILISATION?*

Professor H. G. Wood's six lectures to Cambridge students entitled *Christianity and Civilisation* make a very valuable little book on a difficult theme. In spite of the title, *Christianity and Civilisation,* the relations between civilisation and the Christian religion, as dealt with by Prof. Wood, are largely indirect.

> 'The message of Jesus was concerned with the Kingdom of God and the things of eternity even more than the things of time. Jesus did not deal directly with political or economic issues. He did not come to save civilisation. He came to save men and women.'

But Christian civilisation means something. This war will decide whether liberty, justice, mercy and truth or their opposites will be the foundation of western civilisation. Liberty, justice, mercy and truth summarise the humanitarianism which has been the basis of our civilisation for a thousand years. It is our legacy from Greece and Palestine, and we owe most to Palestine. For the Christian message that God is the Father of all men, with its corollary that all men are brothers, 'gave to the humanitarianism of the ancient world a confidence, a comprehensiveness and a depth which it previously had not possessed.'

In his first lecture Professor Wood illustrates this, showing that the spiritual basis of western civilisation is faith in the Christian message. But is this faith justified? In his second and third lectures he examines two modern challenges to Christian faith, first from scientific humanism, second from the Marxian philosophy. Here he is everything a Christian controversialist should be. He is witty but never cheap or mean. He keeps his temper. He attacks his

* *Christianity and Civilisation,* by H. G. Wood. (C.U.P. 3/6. 1942.)

opponents where they are strongest, and freely admits the truth their contentions contain. His purpose is not to score points but to speak truth. Those who know his little book, *The Truth and Error of Communism,* will have appreciated his power of searching analysis. Here his statement is much shorter, but equally convincing. To-day we are full of admiration for the heroic resistance of the Russians to the Germans, but sympathy for the Russians should not make us call error truth.

Two chapters follow, discussing the sort of changes in national and international affairs which Christian principles prompt. Here Professor Wood handles the problem of the use of force very judiciously. Jesus repudiated the use of force, as is shown by his conduct and by the three temptations. But force is the instrument which all statesmen must employ; it is therefore necessary to have a clear idea as to what force can achieve and when its use is wrong. These chapters will be very useful to churchmen who take to heart the admonition of our Archbishops to think seriously on political problems. If this book has a weakness, it is to be found in its pacifist tendency. It is too ready to accept German complaints of unjust treatment and not to face the problem of dealing with German guilt. The British blockade after the 1918 armistice is called iniquitous. It was not iniquitous or contrary to international law, but it was a political blunder. Mr. Churchill's advice to send food ships to Germany at once without conditions or payment was much more statesmanlike.

Professor Wood rightly warns us that after the war

> 'we must not repeat the mistake we made after the last war and try to disembarrass ourselves of responsibilities . . . England must remain embodied in Europe.'

But he does not show us the right way to achieve this. The settling up of Europe and the world after the war will be very slow, tedious and expensive. It will require from us great patience, self-control, wisdom and the readiness to make sacrifices. We shall find little help if we follow his advice and do what Bernard Shaw told us to do after the last war, pray 'God forgive us all.' Doubtless we all need forgiveness, as do the judge on the bench, the prisoner in the dock, and his victim. But there are degrees of wickedness. The 'God forgive us all' attitude may easily lead us to blur the moral differences between Germany and her many victims. It is easy to forgive the wrongs which have been done to others, and it may even appear generous to do so. Lord Vansittart is right in saying that Germany's victims must get justice before Germany gets it. When the war is won the problem of establishing an international order to maintain peace will be difficult, and the problem of re-educating the Germans so that they are fit to share in it will be more difficult still. In order that we may do our proper share in these great tasks, we shall need faith in God who is calling us to these great works for the benefit of mankind, and faith in ourselves that we can, with His help, do the work to which He is calling us.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

KIRJATH-SEPHER OR THE SATELLITE EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY

The attractive idea of *The School Base,** written by the Warden of Bembridge School, is that school buildings should cease to be built in thickly-populated areas and should be grouped together at 'the school base,' a country site with ample playing field accommodation. Such a policy would make it financially possible to provide for a community of schools those educational necessities, such as a Chapel, Art Gallery and Concert Hall, which no single and separate school can hope to possess.

* *The School Base,* by J. Howard Whitehouse. (Humphrey Milford and O.U.P., pp. 47, price 1/-. 1943.)

Readers of the *Modern Churchman* will be particularly interested in the sections on Humanism and Religious Teaching.

> 'I think,' writes the author on p. 41, 'that many would agree with me that progress is likely to be made, not in teaching the distinctive dogmas of religious bodies which divide, but rather the things which unite.'

This is true, but I would suggest that 'the things which unite' are not points of dogma but methods of enquiry and modes of thought. The vital division is between those who think of religion as a 'revealed' body of doctrine, final and complete, to be accepted on authority, and those for whom religion signifies man's unending quest to solve the supreme mysteries and whose doctrine is therefore not static but progressive, changing as that knowledge of man and the universe changes of which the doctrine is proffered as an explanation. Among the various groups who take the authoritarian view rather than the experimental view of religion, the 'common worship,' which the author desires, is I think impossible, but 'common worship' is a possibility amongst members of the second group, in spite of wide-reaching differences of opinion, because they share a common way of thought and pursue the same method of enquiry.

S.R.W.

SIN AS SEEN BY A MODERNIST*

Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States, was a man of religious habits. Having attended divine service, he sat down to his Sunday dinner. His wife enquired, 'What was the sermon about, Calvin?' The President replied, 'Sin.' His wife asked, 'What view did the preacher take?' The President answered, 'He was against it.' Preachers invariably are against sin, but laymen have much less decided views than have the preachers.

There are three theories of the origin of sin, and they are as follows: (1) the orthodox conception that Adam and Eve sinned in the Garden of Eden, and in consequence brought a curse on all mankind; (2) the idea that sin first originated in some cosmic act before the beginning of history; (3) that sin is a relic of the lower animal nature not yet overcome by mankind.

(1) The first theory was adopted by Paul, and in consequence became the belief of the Church. But after all we must remember that Paul's theory was only one of the three current theories in Jewish theology.

(*a*) The most popular theory was that of the fall of the angels who sinned with mortal women, and we have the *torso* of the legend in *Genesis* vi, 1-6. Judging from the pseudepigrapha literature, particularly the elaborate account in the *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, its romance seems to have appealed to the Jewish imagination. The angels who fell were confined and punished, but the disembodied spirits of their children were allowed to roam the earth and to do evil until the Judgment Day. We have an echo of this belief in *Matthew* viii, 29, where the two demoniacs cry to Jesus: 'Son of God, what business have you with us? Have you come here to torment us before it is time?'

(*b*) The Eden story, which, strangely enough, appears to have had little or no influence on earlier Hebrew thought; at least Old Testament allusions are few and uncertain. If the rendering of the Revised Version be correct there is a reference to the Fall in *Job* xxxi, 33, 'If like Adam I covered my transgressions,' and in *Hosea* vi, 7, 'But they like Adam have transgressed the covenant.' But in the former passage the rendering should probably be 'after the manner of men,' and this rendering would also be admissible in the latter passage. The Garden of Eden is mentioned a few times by the prophets of the captivity. There is the splendid poetical passage in *Ezekiel*

* Bibliography.—Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*; Orchard, *Modern Theories of Sin*; Tennant, *The Origin and Propagation of Sin, The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin, The Concept of Sin*; N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*; Dodd, *The Meaning of Paul for To-day*; articles in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* and Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

xxviii, 1-8, and also an allusion by the same prophet in xxxi, 9. See also *Isaiah* li, 3, and *Job* ii, 3. The *Book of Proverbs* occasionally mentions a tree of life (iii, 18; xi, 30). *Psalm* xc, 3 is supposed to take up the language of *Genesis* iii, 19; and it is possible there are reminiscences of the curse upon the serpent in *Micah* vii, 17 and in *Isaiah* lxv, 25. The conception of a personal tempter of mankind appears in the prologue to the *Book of Job*, and also in *I Chronicles* xxi, 1, and *Zechariah* iii, 1. The first identification of Satan with the serpent is in *Wisdom* ii, 24, 'Nevertheless through envy of the devil came death into the world.' There is controversy as to the date of this book: it may belong to either the latter half of the last century B.C., or even to A.D. 40.

(c) The official Rabbinical doctrine was that sin was due to the *yeçer-ha-ra* (the evil imagination), thereby boldly asserting that God was the author of evil.

Now the Eden story is a valuable parable of how all men commit sin when they deliberately do something which they know to be contrary to Divine command. But modern theology cannot accept the opening chapters of *Genesis* as actual history: the story of the Fall in *Genesis* is what, in technical language, we call an aetiological legend, that is, a story written to explain the cause and meaning of something; in this case it explains why men have to toil in subduing the soil in order to live, and why women suffer pain in childbearing.

(2) The second theory (a pre-mundane Fall) is held by some eminent theologians such as Dr. Müller in *The Christian Doctrine of Sin* and Dr. N. P. Williams in his fine book *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*. In some ways it is an attractive theory, and would certainly explain many of our problems, but it is an hypothesis which is purely speculative, and there are really no data to support it. It has some connection with the angels in *Genesis* vi, 1-6, and in the *Book of Enoch*, and as such is only interesting as an historical record of a primitive religious belief.

(3) The third view attempts to give a scientific theory of the origin of sin, and bases it upon the doctrine of evolution, assuming that man gradually developed from a lower animal, and so sin is the yielding to the brute impulses of the lower animal nature in opposition to the claims of reason and conscience. It is in line in some ways with the official Rabbinic doctrine that sin was due to the *yeçer-ha-ra* (the evil imagination). Hence man is born not wholly evil, as taught by the old theology, nor good until corrupted by society, as taught by Rousseau, but a being possessed of two natures. As he evolves, the higher and the spiritual make more and more exacting demands upon him; and when he refuses those higher demands, and deliberately chooses the lower and the easier, then he falls into sin. As Dr. Tennant so well puts it:

> 'To the evolutionist sin is not an innovation, but is the survival or misuse of habits and tendencies that were incidental to an earlier stage in development, whether of the individual or of the race. But this fall from innocence was in another sense a rise to a higher grade of being. It is in this sense that the theory of evolution teaches us to interpret the story of the Fall. It gives a deeper meaning to the truth that sin is lawlessness' (*The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and of Original Sin*, pp. 82-3).

Perhaps 'lawlessness' is the best definition of sin. We read in *I John* iii, 4, 'Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness: and sin is lawlessness,' and this only states a sober fact. Break a natural or a spiritual law and you are certain to suffer for it: that is the universal law. If you place your hand in the fire you are certain to be burnt, and if you allow your lower animal nature its full rein, make no attempt to conquer the ape and the tiger which is certainly latent in all of us—how the history of the world during the past few years has proved this — we shall presently find ourselves spiritually dead,

incapable of rising to that spiritual state which is the will of God. Can anything be more terrible!

Dr. Dodd in *The Meaning of Paul for To-day* (p. 83) well puts this in the following words:

> '"The Wrath of God," therefore, as seen in actual operation, consists in leaving sinful human nature to "stew in its own juice." This is a sufficiently terrible conception, but if we believe, as Paul did, in any measure of human free will, what else is to happen if men choose stedfastly to ignore God?'

Though we believe in a 'far off divine event' when the entire universe will be reconciled to God, one cannot shut one's eyes to the fact that for many it will mean travel along a hard and painful road. If we stifle all our ideals, starve our spiritual nature, at the end of life we shall find ourselves in the bankrupt position of Ibsen's Peer Gynt. To him the thread-balls, the withered leaves, the sighing in the air, the broken strains spoke of the thoughts that he should have thought, the message he should have proclaimed, the songs he should have sung, the deeds he should have performed; and the Button-Moulder plainly tells him he has never developed a soul, that his life has been barren and nought.

S. H. N. PILCHER.

YOUTH AND RECONSTRUCTION

The Religious Education Press has added another useful little volume to its many recent publications designed to help teachers and others who are faced with the perplexing task of preparing Youth to take its place in a world which within the space of a very few years—and perhaps even months—will bear little resemblance to the world now dying amid the horror and clamour of global war.

In planning for the post-war reconstruction, those who care for the moral and spiritual tone of the New Age must surely place among their chiefest objectives the guarantee that Democracy shall carry with it into the future the duty of free enquiry into the Truth and the right of every man to pursue that enquiry. If this principle is to inform the thought and action of the rising generation, then habits of wide tolerance and spacious charity must be formed in the youth of to-day. To fix such habits in our young people is evidently the aim of those who have collected (out of their own experience in Youth Centres and Boys' and Girls' Clubs) a compact little set of 'burning topics' entitled *Talking Things Over*.*

It is an attempt to give guidance to those club leaders who would 'help their young people to *think* their way through to a satisfying philosophy of life.' The book is liberal in temper. The one 'prescribed conclusion'—for even liberals have their bed-rock principles!—is that the best answers to all questionings are still to be found in the teachings of the Bible, and in the mission and message of Jesus Christ.

There are in all thirty-two questions—'stated,' 'explored,' and 'discussed.' They raise fundamental issues in conduct and ethics, for the individual as well as for the nation; there is also an excellent little bibliography designed to supplement the information given in the text. There are to-day hosts of spectacular ways of promoting Victory for the freedom of the human spirit; but it is doubtful whether there are any more effective ways of preparing the soil in which this freedom may flourish than the patient and reasonable education in 'charitable Controversy' which this book aims to foster. It deserves a wide sale, and will be acceptable to all men of goodwill who enjoy, rather than fear, 'talking things over' with the young and the critical.

R. B. PARKER.

* *Talking Things Over*: Discussion Topics for Youth Centres, ed. R. G. Martin, M.A. (Religious Education Press, Wallington, Surrey. pp. 190. 3/6 net. 1943.)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH LIBERTY*

The appearance of the final volume of Professor Mackinnon's *History of Modern Liberty* after an interval of a generation since the previous volume was published adds to the interest of its perusal. The reader has a natural eagerness to discover whether the author has changed his outlook or opinions during the interval. The long delay, indeed, was caused by Professor Mackinnon's deflection of interest after his appointment in 1908 to the Regius Professorship of Ecclesiastical History at Edinburgh. But his retirement from that office has brought the leisure necessary to complete his study, and the intervening period has dimmed neither his learning nor his enthusiasm. Meanwhile, Dr. W. K. Jordan's monumental history of *The Development of Toleration in England* has appeared, and though his survey stops short with 1660 it challenges comparison with the work of Dr. Mackinnon.

It may be said at once that the present volume continues the characteristics of its predecessors both in its solidity of research, independence of judgment, and liberalism of outlook. Professor Mackinnon's volume is reminiscent of the work of Sir Charles Firth. He rejoices in the achievement of religious and political liberty in seventeenth-century Great Britain; and he has no doubt of its intrinsic worth. His judgments are interesting and individual; thus, for example, he appreciates Charles I, deeming him both a martyr and a delinquent; and, whilst appreciating the greatness and sincerity of Cromwell, criticises him freely in points of detail. In English affairs he follows in the steps of Gardiner and Firth; and in the chapters dealing with Scotland makes his distinctive contribution to our knowledge of the period. His verdicts on Charles II and James II are severe but not inappreciative, and he clearly thinks the glorious Revolution to be rather less glorious and more utilitarian than its whig champions. His study concludes with two excellent chapters on the political thought of the period, in which Hobbes and Locke are admirably summarised and discussed.

Professor Mackinnon has rounded off his work in a notable volume; and his research, his exposition and his judgments evoke the admiration of his readers. He has a profound belief in the importance of the struggles which he chronicles and the value of their result. Liberty at present is under a cloud, but Professor Mackinnon's survey is undarkened by any clouds of lack of appreciation of liberty. During the interval since the publication of Volume III, a great deal of new ground has been explored in the economic and social history of the seventeenth century. It is to be wished that Professor Mackinnon had given his opinion on this work and its contribution to our understanding of the epoch. It is hardly mentioned in his pages. One misses, too, in his bibliography an estimate of Sir W. S. Holdsworth's *History of English Law,* with its acute comments on the constitutional issues at stake. But these are minor points, and their omission does not detract from the interest and value of a most useful volume.

NORMAN SYKES.

RELIGION THROUGH DRAMA

When you are too young to be able to read with ease, and too fidgety to be able to sit still for more than a minute at a time, to be invited by your master or mistress to run about with them and play at being Herod or Elijah or Samuel, or many more such interesting people, is great fun and a great relief. Hence the dramatic method of 'rubbing in' Bible, as well as other, stories; and of its success your reviewer can offer personal testimony. The method confers many other benefits, too, in establishing good relations between teacher and taught, in banishing self-consciousness from both parties in the game; our

* *A History of Modern Liberty,* Vol. IV, 1647–1689, by James Mackinnon. (Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd. 1941.)

immediate concern, however, is with its value in helping the young memory to retain the important stories.

This series of dramatised Bible-readers for use in schools* has been produced in order to help those who like play-acting. Its users must be old enough to read with some speed, but need not be much older than that. They will then learn the O.T. stories in just the same way as the mediaeval audiences of the miracle plays did. The first book of the series tells the story of the Hebrew people from Abraham to Joshua in five acts; the second, in three parts each of three acts, dramatises the remaining stories, beginning with the Judges, Ruth and Samuel, through Saul, David and Solomon, and finishing with the prophets; the stories of these,† in Book II, Part 3, are the immediate occasion of this review. There is no need in this periodical to stress the vital importance of the prophets to all who would understand O.T. religion; and the sooner the stories about them are memorised by the young student, the better for his future understanding of his own religion.

According to the publisher, 'the beauty and grandeur of the Bible language has been preserved as far as possible. Only when they would convey little sense to the modern mind have the words been paraphrased or replaced by Prof. Moffat's translation.' But a certain amount of extra matter has had, of course, to be added. This is a very difficult thing to do. The authoress, or editress, has not always escaped the atmosphere of *Ye Olde Tudor Tea Shoppe* on the arterial road, and the diction is sometimes, to say the least, artificial. To a certain extent my objection has been anticipated by some words of the explanatory pamphlet, 'This work is not intended for acting [in public], but for impromptu impersonation by the pupil.'

The scenes included in this volume are the major incidents in the lives of Elijah and Elisha; Amos, as social and as religious reformer; Hosea—a difficult subject to treat for the young; the title of the first scene is 'The Triumph of Love,' and the offence of his wife is somewhat glossed over. In the life of First Isaiah there are four scenes, of Micah one scene, of Jeremiah six, and of Ezekiel four. In the case of the Second Isaiah it is obviously much harder to pick on suitable incidents for this purpose, and only one is here; while later prophets have three.

There are valuable and sensible introductory and connecting notes, from a reasonably modern standpoint. The illustrations, of which there are many, are mainly specimens of Victorian representative art, rather of the Christmas Supplement sort. Why is it that such pictures have become the customary means of livening up school books, especially school books which break with tradition in so many other respects? The only exception is the reproduction of the grand Sargent frieze of the O.T. prophets from the Public Library of Boston, U.S.A., a picture, or series, which even in reproduction contains an authentic vigour and life.

A chronological chart of O.T. history is also included, and a fairly comprehensive index.

W. H. OLDAKER.

EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY ‡

Under the shock of the Nazi menace the British have seemingly awakened from their complacent acknowledgment that Education is the Cinderella Department. They have seen the strength of the state which has energetically and purposefully planned its education, and though they abhor the principles and values taught in Germany, they are beginning to realize that the Nazi

* *A Dramatised Bible Reader, for use in Schools*, by Elizabeth G. Gray. (The Grant Educational Company (London) Ltd.)

† Book II, Part 3 (of the above series): The Prophets. 3/9.

‡ *Education for Democracy*, by Margaret Cole. (George Allen and Unwin. 2/-. 1942.)

strength can only be offset by informing our own education with a definite purpose and with values in which we believe.

The Rev. Arthur Hopkinson has written in *Pastor's Progress*, 'The success or failure of national life after the war will depend above everything else on Education.' There is urgent need for discussion and for the planning of a practical programme *now*. Margaret Cole in her short book *Education for Democracy* has written a concise, emphatic account of the shortcomings of our present educational system and suggested necessary reforms. It is a book well worth reading, for it brings enlightenment and the stimulated interest necessary for the achievement of reform. She outlines the haphazard development of English education, its hotch-potch of glaring inconsistencies, the contrast between public and slum elementary schools and the academic unreality in their teaching. She dismisses the mere raising of the school leaving age as futile until the education given is of more worth. She emphasizes the need to develop the whole personality instead of giving the child a knowledge of unrelated subjects which are crammed for examination purposes but have little other value. In common with other educational reformers, Margaret Cole stresses the importance of making the children feel that their school life is more in contact with the community. Every child is to be taught to understand the State, the local political organization, the community in which it lives, and to realize the importance of social service and the part it can play while at school and, more extensively, when it leaves. Mrs. Cole also insists on the importance of technical and vocational training which will equip the child and must depend on ability and not on parental income. Finally, she deals with the problem which is fundamental to educatonal reform. All education, from the nursery school to the universities, must be informed with a set of values, and the question is what values? The answer is complicated by the diversities of creeds and interpretations of the same creed which characterize our national life. The clergy are beginning to insist that the moral vacuum must be filled by definite religious instruction; but if that means the teaching of dogma, such a scheme would appear to be impractical, for it would inevitably result in deadlock between Roman Catholics, Nonconformists and 'scientific free thinkers.' Margaret Cole urges the emphatic teaching throughout all lessons, of whatever type or subject, of the values of Christian ethics, humanitarianism, altruism, respect for personality, the equality of man, and the need for disinterested social service. We have only been able to deal with some of the principles held by Mrs. Cole; her suggestions about types of schools, the fate of the Public Schools, the curriculum, the institutions and methods which will embody these principles must be found in her book. Naturally, as the problem is so extensive only a book of encyclopaedic length could deal adequately with the details, and undoubtedly there is much in her book that can be criticized; but as a brief programme of educational reform, we can thoroughly recommend *Education for Democracy* for all those who are interested in education, and indeed for those who are not. P.R.

BRIDGE BUILDING*

This book will not please everybody; it is too outspoken. For example, referring to the traditional theology, the author writes:

> 'The bridge was built between God and man. It rested firmly at one end on the Biblical conception of God. That conception has now largely crumbled. At the other end it rested on the Pauline conception of man. Paul, in common with his contemporaries, happened to be mistaken about many aspects of the nature of man. The pier which rises in the middle of the stream to unite the two was still firmly based on the Pauline doctrine

* *Between God and Man*, by John Hadham. (Longmans. 3/6. 1942.)

> of a demi-God Redeemer Lord, and the Johannine doctrine of a son sent by a Father. These two conceptions still dominate every aspect of prayer and praise in our public worship, and the greater part of our theology. Unfortunately, neither of them is true.'

Of course it would be easy to pick holes in this — to say that there is more than one conception of God to be found in the Bible; to say that Paul's doctrine of a Redeemer Lord was not the whole of his teaching about Christ; to point out that the *Logos* doctrine meant more than is indicated above. At the same time, the passage as a whole is true enough, for the fact remains that the Church speaks in a foreign language, uses ideas which have lost their meaning. It does no longer speak to every man 'in the tongue wherein he was born.' It is therefore impotent to be creative in our age or sustain it in its need. What we want 'is a new bridge, not a repair of the old.' 'No man putteth a piece of new cloth on an old garment.'

In a world which seems to have lost its bearings it is natural that a plea should be made for a return—to Calvin, to Aquinas, to Augustine, who gave their respective ages the guidance and inspiration that our age needs and lacks. No doubt we can learn much from all three; but we must find our own truths. The chief trouble is that though the modern scientist recognizes that his conclusions are tentative and his doctrines experimental, no such admissions are made by official exponents of religion with regard to their intellectual statements. 'It is a question of *method* rather than of *conclusions*.' May it not be a mistake to foster the illusion of finality in the spiritual sphere?

Our author does not believe that 'the majestic symmetry of the traditional Christian faith' can be replaced in a generation. For some time to come 'men will be fumbling for a re-expression of their faith.' It is the fashion to disparage the idea of new creeds, saying that they will be obsolete before they are out of the printer's hands. This is indeed likely to be the case 'if we think of new creeds as demanding the same uniformity of acceptance.'

> 'For a period it will be necessary to recognize that men may come together for work and worship united only by sincerity and by the belief that there is a creative power behind the world, and a purpose in life; and that nothing is to be gained by demanding of them the repetition of words in which they cannot sincerely believe. There was no creed, and there still is none, in the Judaism from which the churches grew.'

John Hadham's book does not confine itself to a general criticism of the theological immobility of ecclesiastical institutions, but contains some very interesting constructive ideas. The chapter called 'The Ascent' is a brilliant summary of the development of Hebrew religious ideas, and the account of the theology of St. Paul is also admirable. Our author evidently has a genuine knowledge of and sympathy with Judaism, and, what is too rare, he does justice to the Pharisees, those founders of a non-sacerdotal, lay, and moralistic religion. The weakness of Pharisaism was that it 'failed to provide a satisfactory answer to the problem of suffering.' What it did was to take the religion of the prophets and turn it into the stuff of everyday life. 'They found that new synthesis between ethics and ritual which guarded the humility of man and the holiness of God.' As for the problem of suffering, this found its supreme expressions in the Servant Songs and in *Job* — 'one of the most magnificent dramas ever written.'

> 'The reason why these two statements of the problem of suffering stand alone, and had so little effect upon the development of contemporary Judaism, is that for their solution they depend on the realization that the bridge between God and man needs building from the side of God as well as from the side of man. If man has to understand that the maximum moral and ethical achievement of which he is capable is still not enough to make him worthy of the esteem of God, *the same is true of God also.*

For if sin separates man from God, suffering separates God from man. If man needs constantly to apologise to God for his failures to be his best, God needs to apologize to man for the fact that in the world which he, and not man, made, undeserved and bitter suffering is constantly taking place. God must make his approach to man, as well as man to God.'

This is John Hadham's approach to the Incarnation:

'God stepped into the world to do what only he could do. In the deepest sense he came to do his duty in a world whose creation was entirely his responsibility. It was not a task which he could delegate to another, neither was it a task which he could perform in any other way. . . .

'God neither "gave" nor "sent." He *came* . . . to assume that humanity which he had created in his own image. A paradox? Why not? A mystery? Of course. By what logic can we deny that paradox and mystery exist in the world?'

We have quoted these two passages, which are typical, in order to show that this book contains as many positive and fertile ideas as drastic criticism. It is quite a remarkable performance.

J.C.H.

AMERICAN RELIGIOUS BOOKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED

The following brief reviews of religious books published in America from May 1, 1941, to May 1, 1942, should be of use to some of our readers. They have been selected from a reasoned catalogue of *Oustanding Religious Books* released at the 64th Annual Conference of the American Library Association. The notes represent the judgement of a committee of eminent American theological and Biblical scholars.

Brown, W. A. *A Creed for Free Men.* (New York, Scribner, 1941; $2.50.)
A study of the loyalties that divide and the faith that unites, pointing out the interdependence and the complementary character of Christianity and the democratic way of life.

Buckham, J. W. *The Inner World.* (New York, Harper, 1941; $3.50.)
A book shot through with the wisdom of a ripe scholar and mature thinker who has made it his business across the years to develop a personalist philosophy of religion. For the general reader as well as the scholar.

Buttrick, G. A. *Prayer.* (New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942; $2.75.)
An original and profoundly moving study of the significance and value of prayer in our lives. It is particularly valuable in our period of stress, as a source of the courage and power needed to withstand the temporary hardships which must be suffered in order to reach the future good.

Case, S. J. *Christianity in a Changing World.* (New York, Harper, 1941; $2.00.)
Taking a long view of the entire history of Christianity, Dr. Case answers the question as to the chances of survival of Christianity confronted by the modern world crisis. The author is critical in his judgment but hopeful.

Eckhart, Meister. *Meister Eckhart*; a Modern Translation, by R. B. Blakney. (New York, Harper, 1941; $2.00.)
The first modern translation of one of the most important of the medieval mystics. It fills a need in English scholarship, since Eckhart's influence extends from religion and theology into philosophy, literature and allied subjects.

Ferré, N. F. S. *The Christian Faith.* (New York, Harper, 1942; $2.00.)
An inquiry into the adequacy of the Christian faith as man's ultimate religion by one of the ablest of the younger theologians who is at once mystic and rationalist. Rich in insights, sound judgments and stimulating thoughts.

Fleming, D. J. *The World at One in Prayer.* (New York, Harper, 1942; $2.00.)

Following the pattern of his other volumes in the series intended to illustrate the creative life in the younger churches, the author has gathered together private and public Christian prayers from Asia, the Islands, Africa, etc., which often by strange idioms and local imagery stir imaginations and devotion.

Hough, L. H. *The Christian Criticism of Life.* (New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1941; $2.50.)

In a series of wide-ranging essays, linked together by a constant concern for humanistic values, the author interprets Christianity as the conserver of civilization. His thesis is that by its criticism of impulse and barbarism Christianity has kept the mind alive.

Kepler, T. S. *Contemporary Religious Thought.* (New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1941; $3.50.)

An anthology of sixty selections by some of the leading religious thinkers of to-day. The articles have been well chosen and cover six general themes, *viz.* the nature of religion, the finding of religious truth, the idea of God, the problem of evil, the meaning of worship, and immortality.

Latourette, K. S. *The Unquenchable Light.* (New York, Harper, 1941; $2.00.)

Answers the question why the influence of Jesus has spread, persisted and increased in some areas and not in others; why it has gone forward like a tide with successive flow and ebb; and what of the future of Christianity in the light of the past.

Maritain, Jacques. *Ransoming the Time.* (New York, Scribner, 1941; $3.00.)

A book of real importance for the serious reader in the field of the philosophy of religion, by one of the greatest of Catholic thinkers. The essays range from Pascal and Bergson to mysticism and the question 'Who is my neightbour?'

Miller, Hugh. *Christian Truth in History.* (New York, Harper, 1941; $2.50.)

A study of the casual connection between Christianity and what is best and most enduring in our civilization, with emphasis on the rôle of Christianity in the future reconstruction of the world.

Oxnam, G. B. *Ethical Ideals of Jesus in a Changing World.* (New York, Abingdon, 1942; $1.00.)

A vigorous and challenging application of the ideals of Jesus to the modern situation, particularly to international and economic affairs.

Paton, William. *The Church and the New Order.* (New York, Macmillan, 1941; $1.50.)

A view of Christian principles regarding the world reconstruction after the war, from one of the best informed and ecumenically-minded religious leaders of to-day. The author, a British churchman, is secretary of the International Missionary Council.

Scott, E. F. *Nature of the Early Church.* (New York, Scribner, 1942; $2.00.)

Competent scholarly answers to questions as to how the Early Church was organized, how it functioned, and how the immediate followers of Christ conducted their religious services. Stresses the tension between the expected Kingdom of God and the non-fulfilment of this apocalyptic hope which is fundamental to the understanding of early Christianity.

Sharpe, D. R. *Walter Rauschenbusch.* (New York, Macmillan, 1942; $2.75.)

A competently written biography of an important figure in the history of American Protestantism. It reveals the sturdily attractive character of this original and forward-looking theologian and social philosopher.

Sheen, F. J. *A Declaration of Independence.* (Milwaukee, Bruce, 1941; $1.75.)

An incisive and vivid analysis of some of the root evils of our time, together with an equally vivid and incisive statement of the principles that must be applied in order to cure these evils. It is a stimulating and provocative work by an outstanding religious leader and spokesman.

Torrey, C. C. *Documents of the Primitive Church.* (New York, Harper, 1941; $3.50.)

A recognized Biblical scholar presents new evidence for his thesis that the Gospels are derived from Aramaic originals. This is a volume intended primarily for scholars, and must be considered by those who do not agree with the author's basic contentions as well as by those in agreement with him.

Wieman, R. W. *The Family Lives its Religion.* (New York, Harper, 1941; $2.00.)

A valuable contribution to the problem of religion in the home, marked by sound psychological knowledge and religious insight. H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

Sir,

A TRIBUTE TO MISS EDITH DOWELL

It would hardly be right to allow our very good friend Miss Edith Dowell to give up the position of Assistant Secretary to the M.C.U., which she has held for so many years and in which she has rendered such conspicuous and loyal service to the Union and the cause for which we stand, without some attempt on my part as Chairman of the Council to express the very great debt of gratitude which every member of the M.C.U. owes to her.

I have myself only been intimately connected with the work of the London office for the last five or six years, but they have been such years as would have daunted the soul of any but the bravest. When bombs fell and houses burned, and most of those who could fled from the Capital, Miss Dowell remained serene and apparently indifferent to danger at her post which nothing would induce her to leave. Council, in its kindness, might pass resolutions; friends might advise and even threaten; all to no purpose. There was Miss Dowell at her post, doing all the niggling little jobs that fall to the lot of secretaries even in the best of times, and doing them well. How well, only her intimates and successors realise.

For many years she has been giving the greater part of her services to us. For these and other reasons which space prevents me from mentioning, but which are known to many of our members in this country and in distant lands, the small pension which the Council has voted for Miss Dowell must be considered as the part-discharge of a debt of honour.

R. B. Henderson,
Chairman of the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

New College, Oxford.
January 22nd, 1943.

Sir,

AN EMBROIDERED BIOGRAPHY

Canon R. D. Richardson's review of Mr. Ellis Roberts' *Life of H. R. L. Sheppard* strikes me as entirely just. May I add a word about his school-days?

He was born within a few months of me and went to Marlborough one term later than I did, in May, 1894. He was placed in a house adjacent to me. If it be true that a budding genius was almost driven to attempted

suicide by a cruel master, and removed prematurely by his father, it is strange that I never heard of such a grave scandal till nearly half a century later. I have compared notes with an old schoolfellow who was either in his form or the next one to it, but he does not remember Sheppard either. There must be many men living who could throw more light on the facts than I can, but as far as I can test the biographer's accuracy it is not to be trusted.

Sheppard was at Marlborough not for a year, but five terms. The report quoted inaccurately (the title 'Head Master' was never used) is from his second half-term. He was then so high in his form that he must have been promoted in January, 1895. In that case the master who gave him that excellent report was not, as is suggested, the master who bullied him as a hopeless fool. And if he was 'popular and good at games,' why that little room in the town for out-of-school hours? Games were compulsory, and the town was out of bounds after 1.30 every day. And if he soaked his bed repeatedly 'with his jug,' the matron would have had something to say about it, and his housemaster too. Incidentally, there were no jugs! He would have had to carry the water either in a large basin or in a tooth-mug from another room.

It is most unfortunate that the *Life* was written by a journalist with an anti-snob complex and views of his own to air about bishops and deans whom he dislikes. The description of the Bishop of Birmingham's views on the Eucharist is so dishonest, and so popular with ignorant persons, that I am glad to see Canon Richardson's quotation from *Should such a Faith Offend?* But I think the reference should be to pp. 321 and 322. In his Preface, p. xxi, the Bishop says: 'Some to whom the science of experimental psychology is strange have imagined that I proposed to apply a chemical test to the consecrated elements. Needless to say, I made no such childish suggestion.'

T. F. Royds.

Haughton Rectory, Stafford.
January 14th, 1943.

Sir,

THE DOCTRINE OF THE *DOCTRINAL REPORT*

With regard to the *Doctrinal Report*, commented on by the Rev. T. J. Wood in your September issue where the Atonement is dealt with, it is much to be regretted that the Report kept the language of the old view. The traditional doctrine of the Atonement — that before mankind could be saved it was necessary for Christ to die in order to propitiate God — is one which should have been scrapped long ago. Such a doctrine is merely the Old Testament one of blood and sacrifice all over again, Christ taking the place of the animal offered up in order to turn away God's wrath from the Israelites. This doctrine persisted in by the orthodox clergy is thoroughly sub-Christian, and one marvels that the great majority of Christians, including the whole of the Roman Catholic Church, can hold such a view. It is regrettable therefore that the *Report* did not accept what is known as the Moral or Abelardian Theory of the Atonement. This would not mean that all must accept this particular view.

Russell Jones.

Willowbrook, Wraysbury, Staines.
November 18, 1942.

Sir,

COMPULSORY COMMUNISM

The hardest kicks, it seems, are delivered by the feet at which once I sat, and I trust that I may be granted space to point out why they have failed to reach their mark.

Your comments on my pamphlet 'Christians in the Class Struggle' show that you choose to ignore the distinction between socialism and communism which is of such vital importance. The phrase 'Compulsory Communism' is a contradiction in terms, for communism is the name given to the voluntary

stage of common ownership which will emerge from the compulsory stage, which is properly called socialism. Of course, early Christian 'communism' was voluntary — it was also *distributive* — *i.e.* it was not a communal ownership of the means of production, but was limited to a sharing of such commodities as were possessed by the group. Naturally, such a system depended for its success on a rapid termination of the existing order, and failed miserably when that event did not occur.

In stressing the voluntary nature of Christian distributive communism you are answering an argument which does not appear in my pamphlet. At the same time you ignore the fact that through the development of machinery and the use of modern industrial methods the 'means of production' have been so revolutionized that what was hitherto impossible has now become possible — namely, in what is now an age of potential plenty common ownership can be carried back from commodities to productive resources themselves. Monastic communism, on the other hand, is a reversion to primitive production for consumption — it is non-industrial and can succeed only in relatively small agricultural communities.

Socialism is the name given to the stage of transition between capitalism and communism, and during its establishment and consolidation requires a measure of compulsion to suppress any attempt to restore the old order. Such force is wielded in the interests of the majority economic class by their representatives, and is to be compared with the coercive power wielded by a small minority in the capitalist ordering of society. When you say 'Communism can only be realized by compulsion: this makes Communism the enemy of freedom,' you are in fact defining an abstraction which you call 'freedom' in terms of capitalism. The 'freedom' to which you refer is essentially freedom for economic exploitation, and you beg the whole question by your tacit assumption that there is no element of compulsion in the present system. In actual fact the private ownership of the means of production, together with the power of life and death which this involves, is backed by the elaborate machinery of the State, resting ultimately upon armed force.

Again, the undeniable social advances which have been made in recent years must be measured against the degree of insecurity and poverty which still remains in England, and must be seen as being, in no small measure, at the expense of the 'coloured' parts of the Empire.

Finally, when you speak of the 'English way . . . also the Christian way, of securing reform,' will you not remember that it is but three hundred years since a number of political and economic changes were achieved in England in a civil war when an English Christian king had his head cut off by his English Christian subjects?

One of my main objects in writing the pamphlet was to put clearly before Christians the facts of the present economic conflict in order that when the moment is reached for the change to be made, they may not encourage reactionary elements to attempt armed resistance to an inevitable development. At its inception, those Christians were right who supported capitalism as a progressive movement emerging from feudalism, but now that capitalism has become monopolistic and imperialistic it is the duty of Christians to take the side of the new progressive movement, *viz.* socialism. It is their duty because their faith demands that they should fight against anything which disrupts community, and fight for everything which makes for brotherhood. As a reaction against feudalism, capitalism was a progressive movement towards brotherly equality, but now, in its last stages, it can only lead to fascism. Therefore it must be overthrown, and Christians must ally themselves with the political movements which they judge will best accomplish the change.

GILBERT COPE.

The Vicarage, 28 Maypole Lane, Birmingham 14.
February 2nd, 1943.

[When Mr. Cope describes our phrase 'Compulsory Communism' as a contradiction in terms, and asserts that although Socialism makes use of force Communism does not use force, we can only refer him to the *Oxford Dictionary*, in which no reference is made to his distinction. Communism and Socialism may be realised by either voluntary or compulsory methods. Marxist Communism, which advocates class war, is an outstanding example of the use of force by Communism on the largest scale, and there are many other examples of the Communist use of force.

On the other hand, Fabian Socialism is opposed to the use of force, as is Christian Socialism. Socialism may be, as Mr. Cope asserts, an intermediate stage between Capitalism and Communism, but in many cases the term Socialism is used to include Communism. Ebenezer Elliott, who wrote *When wilt Thou save the People?* defined Socialism as follows:

'What is a Socialist? One who has yearnings
For an equal division of unequal earnings;
Bungler or loafer or both, he is willing
To put in his penny and pocket your shilling.'

Many would regard Elliott's definition as that of a Communist, but when Lord Salisbury said we are all Socialists to-day, he meant that we all recognize the need for various social reforms.

We have no space here to traverse Mr. Cope's statements. His view would seem to us ill-founded: *e.g.* that 'the undeniable social advances which have been made in recent years . . . must be seen as being in no small measure at the expense of the "coloured" parts of the Empire.' We believe that it can be shown that no coloured community since it came within the British Empire is not economically better off than when it was outside the Empire.—Ed., *M.C.*]

Sir,

Your readers will be grateful to you for calling attention so prominently to the literature of the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership, not only on account of the profound importance of the subject, but because of the revealing way in which the five quotations given by you disclose the basic confusions of thought which appear always to underlie all propaganda on this question.

If the solution of these universal and increasingly urgent problems is to depend, as it should, on clear thinking or on merits, and not upon violence (as it otherwise will), it is indispensable that the grosser faults in each of the five points raised should at least be identified and exposed.

(1) With regard to the Foreword, which indicts our whole economic system: all freedom and all power is of course liable to grave abuses, which, under democracy, can be remedied or checked precisely in as far as the majority wishes this to be done. What proof, then, is there that a free economic system, as distinct from its abuses, is itself the work of the devil and ought to be destroyed? Or that the application of private resources to private enterprise concerned with the means of production is in itself immoral?

(2) The justification for English democrats for fighting German fascism is pleaded as involving a precisely similar justification for fellow nationals to take similar action against capitalism. What proof is there that the world in general (and Communism in particular) would have continued to be as well off without resorting to violence against German fascists as it has been without resorting to violence against capitalism?

(3) It is declared that 'all the fundamental opposition must be "liquidated" (*i.e.* rendered politically inactive by disfranchisement, and if necessary by im-

prisonment).' But is not this an abuse not only of freedom and power but of democracy itself, equally immoral whether practised by communists against capitalists or by capitalists against communists?

(4) The opposition (having been disfranchised) is invited, as always, to use only 'constitutional methods' (activity having been prohibited), in which case 'they could be dealt with by processes of law, imprisonment, etc,' so that there would be 'no shooting, unless the opposition started it.' Is not this a plain self-contradiction, and an exact imitation of Hitler—to expect no war if only the opposition will submit without resistance?

(5) The difference between religious idealism and Marx's dialectical materialism is admitted, but is expected to be partly resolved in an 'economically classless society.' Is it in accordance with religious idealism that one class should 'liquidate' the other?

A. B. ASHBY.

Wickens, Birch Grove,
near Hayward's Heath, Sussex.
26th January, 1943.

THE EQUALITY OF THE SEXES AND THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

SIR,

Apparently the *Modern Churchman* is content to remain neutral on the important question of the equal ministry of men and women in the Church, which question is fast coming to the fore. But can we expect much diminution of, for example, the horror of venereal disease when the Church, which should *lead* thought, upholds the false and outworn idea of the *spiritual* and therefore *fundamental* inferiority of women to men?

One would have thought that the *Modern Churchman* at all events would have plucked up enough courage to point out that our Lord's views on the relations of the sexes are emphatically *not* those of St. Paul which prevail so largely in the Prayer Book, but that they *are* superior and should be acted on.

THEODORA M. FAGAN.

University Women's Club, 2 South Audley Street, W.1.
January 3rd, 1943.

[We believe, as no doubt do the vast majority of our readers, in the moral and spiritual equality of man and woman. This belief, however, does not necessitate as a Christian duty the admission of men and women on an equality to the ministry of the Christian Church. Jesus Christ, so our correspondent asserts, believed in the equality of the sexes. Yet although women were among those who followed Him and believed in Him, He did not appoint any of them as apostles. If we enquire why, the answer must be that it was practically inexpedient for Him to do so. It is practical inexpedience rather than disbelief in the moral and spiritual equality of the sexes which is restraining episcopal action at the present time. We have urged, and continue to urge, that practical experiment should be made in this sphere, particularly in the development of a woman's ministry, restricted at first in its ministrations to educational institutions and to communities of women. There is a great field for experimental work here. The greatest obstacle to achieving this would seem to lie in the refusal of women themselves to accept at the outset and experimentally a restricted ministry of this character. They would, we believe, be both wise and, in the end, eminently successful if they would consent loyally to this method. *Per angusta ad augusta.*—ED., *M.C.*]

THE VATICAN AND THE WAR

SIR,

On page 187 of your September issue Mr. Gamaliel Milner writes that 'it is very difficult indeed to get an unbiassed account of religion in Germany under Hitler' and quotes Cardinal Innitzer's statement when Hitler entered Austria (as reported in Michael Power's *Religion in the Reich*) as evidence of the 'compromising policy of the Catholic Heirarchy.'

As it is vitally important that we should all do our best to form a just opinion of the Church situation in Germany, may I venture to point out to your readers that weightier books than Mr. Power's small volume are available, notably the Oxford University Press publication, *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church,* by the Congregationalist, Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, and Robert d'Harcourt's *Catholiques d'Allemagne,* which is also published in an English translation. The Dean of Chichester's book, *The Struggle for Religious Freedom in Germany* (Gollancz) is another fairly detailed survey of both the Catholic and Protestant opposition to the Nazis, and I have seen well over twenty shorter publications on the subject which seem to be generally reliable.

Mr. Milner seems to forget that Cardinal Innitzer's unfortunate declaration (upon which he went back a long way a few months later, after he had visited the Vatican and incurred the extreme annoyance of the Nazis) is very far from typical of Roman Catholicism in Germany as a whole. It is true that many leading Nazis were brought up as nominal Catholics, and the Roman Church must therefore take her share of the blame for the way they have turned out, but there is a wealth of evidence (*e.g.* in the writings of Rauschning and Prof. N. H. Baynes' monumental *Hitler's Speeches*) that Hitler and his closest associates detest and fear the Church.

The Papacy has found itself in a very awkward situation in Fascist Italy, and its policy has not always been the wisest in its own interests (let alone ours), but Mr. Milner's contention that the Vatican is a determined supporter of the enemies of the United Nations does not seem to be borne out by the behaviour of the German Episcopate much more than it is by that of Roman Catholics in Poland, Czechoslovakia, the U.S.A. or our own country, or in recent pronouncements of the Pope.

H. P. KINGDON.

Exeter College, Oxford.
February 14th, 1943.

REPLY OF THE REV. GAMALIEL MILNER

The attitude of Roman Catholics towards the war differs, of course, considerably from country to country. English Roman Catholics, which does not mean Roman Catholics in England, are, generally speaking, as loyal as any other Englishmen. Irish Roman Catholics are loyal, to Eire, not to England. In Northern Ireland they usually make no secret of their Axis sympathies. Roman Catholics in Poland are national; many priests have been executed in recent mass executions. As to France, a friend of mine now serving in one of the Armies, who has peculiar opportunities for knowing things from the inside, says, 'You are right, of course, in saying that the party now in power in France is the Clerical.' I was frankly disappointed with the last broadcast from His Holiness. I look upon him as a barometer, not to say a weathercock, and I had expected that in view of our improved military situation he would blow much hotter. There was much edifying denunciation of tyranny and injustice, which anyone can interpret as he pleases, but the only tangible thing he denounced was Marxian Socialism. But much water has flowed down the Volga and the Donetz Basin since the Christmas broadcast. No one, I feel sure, will congratulate us more cordially on our victory, if we win, than Pius XII.

G. MILNER.